

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1880.

## The Week.

WHAT is the sound orthodox doctrine about "seeking the Presidency"? In 1876 it was held by a great number of good Republicans to be a shocking indecorum on the part of Mr. Tilden to superintend his own canvass personally (this was before anything was known or suspected about the cipher negotiations), and in particular to set up a "literary bureau" from which he issued documents of various sorts in support of his claims. We thought ourselves at the time, and think still, that it is far better for a candidate to do this and shoulder the full responsibility of his canvass, than to sit in his parlor while others are cozening and intriguing in his behalf and with his knowledge and consent. Where Mr. Tilden came to grief was in pleading ignorance of the doings of his agents in Baltimore and Charleston after he had formally assumed the personal direction of his electoral operations. But it was said that it was unseemly in him to give any public sign of his desiring the Presidency. Well, does this rule apply to Mr. Sherman? He announced publicly two months ago—indeed, we believe we may also say nearly a year ago—that he was a candidate, and last week took the stump for himself at Mansfield, Ohio, and declared that he wanted the Presidency and meant to get it by fair means if he could. After this it is, of course, not at all improbable that he will open a "literary bureau" in Washington and distribute printed reasons for voting for him. Can anybody tell us how a really good man ought to regard this conduct of his? His speech on the occasion referred to consisted of a modest presentation of himself as a candidate; a eulogy of the Republican party, with corresponding castigation of the Democrats; a glowing account of the condition of the national finances, and very gloomy predictions as to what "the rebel element" will do if they get into power. Should they succeed, he said, in carrying the election of this year, the rebellion of 1861 will be "a success." As the object of the rebellion of 1861 was to set up a confederacy composed exclusively of slave States, and governed by the jurisprudence peculiar to such communities, it seems extraordinary that as dry and unimaginative a person as Mr. Sherman should make such extravagant statements even on the stump.

The third-term movement has been openly and formally started in Massachusetts, and an address to the Republicans of the State, in which Gen. Grant's services to the country during his former two terms are enumerated, is issued. These services include the support of the Fifteenth Amendment, the establishment of the public credit, the reduction of the public debt, the prevention of an inflation of the currency, the making of permanent arrangements for the resumption of specie payments, the settlement of foreign questions which had disturbed the country for generations, and "the vindication of the rights of persons at home and abroad without distinction of color." This plan of claiming for him the credit of every good thing that occurred during his two terms (he actually wrote a message approving the inflation bill on the same day on which he wrote the other vetoing it) is a new one, and is more plausible than "the strong man" plea, but will hardly bear minute examination any better. No attempt is made to explain or deny the scandals which constitute, in the minds of nine out of ten of the opponents of a third-term, the chief objection to it. When we say that Mr. Boutwell and Mr. N. P. Banks are two of the best-known signers of the document, and that Simmons is likely to be a leader in the movement, we give a very good idea of its character. Its object professes to be simply the instruction of the Massachusetts delegation in favor of General Grant.

It has, however, drawn out a strong counter-demonstration from the anti-third-term men in an address signed by some of the best Republicans in the State, many of them members of the present Legislature, and there are only two "Young Republicans" among them. This is worth notice because it is frequently said that the opposition to General Grant in Massachusetts is confined to Independents, Scratchers, and "Democrats at heart." When we say that the list of signers includes such names as E. R. Hoar and John M. Forbes, we indicate clearly enough the serious nature of the opposition of which the address is the expression. It calls attention to the probable closeness of the vote at the next election, and the consequent danger of repelling any section of Republicans, however small; strongly condemns the effort to force a third term on the country as a violation of a sound precedent, uncalled for by any exigency; comments on the dissatisfaction excited in many minds by the character of General Grant's Administration and of some of his personal affiliations, and the consequent likelihood that if nominated the canvass would turn on a defence of his methods and measures instead of on questions of present public importance; denounces "the strong man" cry either as having no meaning, or as indicating an intention to resort to "unconstitutional or revolutionary or questionable methods of government"; ridicules the notion that the South would join in electing Grant, and calls for a candidate who would "command the confidence and enthusiasm of all Republicans."

The proneness of Methodist ministers to nominate General Grant for a third term is a singular phenomenon. Whenever even half a dozen of them are assembled anywhere for any purpose one of them is pretty sure to suggest before the meeting is over, like Senator Carpenter, that the interests of "virtue" call for a third term. At the Annual Conference in this city, the other day, the Rev. J. J. Dean delivered the opening sermon, which was on "True Greatness." He traced the history of "greatness" from ancient times down through the middle ages, with depreciatory references to the love of money and position, until he reached Charles Sumner, from whom he passed to Abraham Lincoln, and then "in this connection" alluded to "another great man, who had twice been President, was likely to be so again, and, he hoped, would be."

Congressional proceedings during the week have at least had a certain liveliness. The General Deficiency Bill in the Senate was amended on Wednesday week so as to vest the appointment of United States special deputy-marshals of elections in the circuit courts, or, if these were not in session, in the district judges. Mr. Blaine unexpectedly turned up with an amendment restoring to the employees of the Government Printing-Office their national holidays without loss of pay—the motive of which became perfectly clear when he was informed (or rather reminded, for he knew it already) that the subject was under favorable consideration by the Committees on Printing of both houses. Mr. Edmunds called him to order for violating a rule of the Senate against adding legislation to a general appropriation bill, and the Chair having decided that the bill could not be so described, Mr. Blaine engaged in what the *Tribune* calls a "gallant struggle," and succeeded in wasting a large part of the session to no purpose except the furtherance of his own reputation for demagoguery. Mr. Carpenter, with Mr. Dawes fighting under cover of him, inflicted a good deal of damage on the magnetic statesman. The bill was passed the next day, in spite of Mr. Edmunds's argument, which we have discussed elsewhere. The Senate has also passed the bill "to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the treaty of peace (1783)," otherwise known as the New York International Exhibition of 1883, and has debated with some asperity the bill to carry out the recent agreement with the Utes made by the Interior Department. The Wallace Committee on frauds at the fall elections has reported a bill to pre-

vent political contributions of money by officers and employees of the Government. In the House the Committee on Contested Elections has agreed to report Mr. Washburn, of Minnesota, not entitled to a seat, and his Democratic opponent, Donnelly, equally without claim—an act of moderation for which Mr. Springer was taken to task, but which will be remembered to his credit. Under the new rules Mr. Weaver got a vote on Monday for his resolution declaring Government the sole source of money, and providing for the payment of the national debt in paper. He found 85 supporters against 117 opponents. On the same day Mr. Townshend tried to pass under a suspension of the rules his surreptitious bill aiming at a revision of the tariff, and succeeded in showing a majority of 113 to 80 in favor of some reform. The Republicans went almost solidly against him; for what reason it would be hard to say.

Mr. Edmunds objected to the appointment of the deputy-marshals by the judges of the United States Circuit Court partly on the ground that the court might not be in session when the election occurred, and then no appointments could be made, and partly on the ground that the judges were not proper persons to appoint executive officers at all, and that, anyhow, the deputy-marshals being the agents of the executive and bound to obey its orders, the plan of dividing them between the two parties was absurd. Officers so appointed would be independent of executive control. Nobody but the court could remove them, and if the court adjourned before the election was over they would remain in office until the court convened again. He ridiculed also the requirement that they should be of "good moral character," on the ground that the term was too vague for legal definition. The remainder of his argument was drawn from the character of the framers of the bill (the Democrats), maintaining that it was but a part of the instrumentalities by which they sought to rob the Government of all control over elections, and to destroy all efficient guaranties of the fairness of elections, and he urged them to pass the bill paying a Government debt, and leave the changes of the law for "more suitable occasions and for better methods," but did not indicate in any way when these occasions would occur.

At the close of March the Treasury bought \$5,000,000 of bonds for the Sinking Fund; but even this unusually large purchase was insufficient to take the loan market out of the control of stock speculators, who ran up the rates for money on several days to 12 to 45 per cent. per annum. The last weekly statement of the New York banks showed that, taken altogether, they hold a reserve less than 25 per cent. of their deposit liabilities by the sum of \$310,000; but as the statement is made upon averages for six days it is likely that at the close of the week the banks were above what is called the legal limit. On this theory the loan market was easier at the close of the week and the rates for foreign exchange immediately advanced. The block in the export of breadstuffs, which was made by stock-exchange speculators, has been broken and the exports are again large, which is against gold shipments in the early future. The Stock Exchange markets were feverish during the week. United States 4 per cent. bonds advanced to 107½, ex-interest due April 1; this is the highest price ever reached, and is an advance of 7½ per cent. within a year, exclusive of the 4 per cent. interest. Mr. W. H. Vanderbilt continues to be a large buyer of these bonds, and now owns something over \$43,000,000 of them. In the speculation of the week, which was fitful but with the tendency towards lower prices, the stocks of the elevated railroads were prominent. That of the Manhattan Company, which leases the Metropolitan and the New York elevated roads, fell from 34½ to 26½. The stock of the Metropolitan fell from 108 to 93½, and that of the New York from 116½ to 113½. Manhattan declined because of the threat of the creators of the company, who were the large stockholders of the other two companies, that they would break up the lease, which is all the property the Manhattan has. Metropolitan declined because if the lease is broken it will not be able on the present capitalization to earn 10 per cent.

dividends, which the Manhattan guarantees to it; and because of the decision, in the case of *Caro vs. this company*, that the elevated railroad companies are liable for damages to adjacent property. If this decision is sustained by the Court of Appeals the elevated companies may expect innumerable suits and claims for many millions of dollars for injury to property. The price of silver was steady during the week and closed at 52½¢ per ounce. The bullion value of the "buzzard dollar" at the close of the week was \$0.8836.

The San Francisco election of last week, which resulted in the decisive defeat of the Workingmen's Party, following so closely upon his conviction and sentence in a criminal proceeding, is generally assumed to be the end of Kearney. His own utterances on the stump immediately prior to the election show much deterioration in fire and enthusiasm, and he even went so far as to read an important speech from manuscript, which probably had a depressing effect upon the ardor of the Sand Lots. The Citizens' Protective Union appear to have taken every precaution within the limits of legitimacy to secure success. Their party included the Republicans and the more respectable of the Democrats, but they were careful to have representatives at the polls to "keep track" of the voting, and to provide ballots of different paper from those procured by their opponents from the Secretary of State. The workingmen threaten, of course, to contest the election on this ground, but will probably not attempt much serious protest, and even if they should the majority against them is so large, being about seven thousand, that they would hardly be able to accomplish anything.

The Commissioners of the State Survey, in their special report to the Legislature on the proposed International Park at Niagara Falls, make a case which must appeal strongly to all cultivated people, by simply setting forth the present condition of the neighborhood of the Falls and its possible amelioration. Lord Dufferin, we believe, is to be credited with originating the idea of an international park, and the Canadian Government stands ready to co-operate with the State of New York whenever the latter signifies its willingness to take any steps in the matter. The whole point is, that the greatest natural spectacle in America, and one of the "wonders of the world," is at present made to serve the merely commercial uses of manufactories, ice-houses, small hotels, laundries, bath-houses, and so on, and that it is entirely possible to rescue it from such perversion. The opinion of Mr. Olmsted, who has examined the neighborhood in conjunction with the Director of the State Survey, is of course conclusive upon the feasibility of the proposed improvement, which contemplates a restoration of the scenery to a state of nature, at least so far as to exclude everything save earth, air, and water, from the observer's range of view. Whether its desirability will be borne in upon our legislators is another question; to all appearances there is, it must be admitted, no "job" in it, and a memorial in its favor has been signed by Messrs. Carlyle, Ruskin, Lowell, Emerson, Max Müller, and others who have presumably no talent whatever for "practical politics." At the same time from the point of view of "practical politics" there is nothing to be said against the scheme, and as to its expense it is perhaps sufficient to say that so rigid an economist as Gov. Robinson strongly favors it.

The latest City Charter underwent a terrible handling before the Cities Committee of the Assembly on Wednesday week at the hands of Mr. George Bliss and Professor Dwight. Mr. Bliss not only exposed its true motive but castigated the members of the committee in a manner which, according to the reporters, made some of them "turn red" and others "look uneasy." One of his interesting pieces of information was that our old friend "Tom" Murphy, some time Collector of this port, has been promised a place in the Public Works Department, and has been feeling so sure of it that he has been going about urging his cronies to send in anticipatory bids for contracts, which shows, if true, that "Tom" is the same thoughtful citi-



zen he was when he used to sit in the Custom-house and "re-organize the party" in this city. Professor Dwight went beyond mere criticism of the proposed change, and laid down some of the principles which should underlie all charter legislation. He showed that a good charter should arm the chief executive officer with great power, and at the same time make his responsibility clear. He should not be compelled, as at present, to share his nominating power with the Aldermen, and he warned the Republicans in the Legislature against using their power over the government of the city to defeat the majority who live under it, as hostile to the fundamental principles of republican government.

The elections in England have resulted—though not over at this writing—in a great Liberal victory. The Liberals will almost certainly have a majority of 46 in the new Parliament without the Home-Rulers, and with the Home-Rulers of 109. They carried Southwark, whose loss at the election two months ago caused so much discouragement, and, in fact, have won back nearly every borough they lost in 1874, though with a few conspicuous exceptions—London for one. To crown all, Mr. Gladstone has carried Mid-Lothian against the Earl of Dalkeith, the son of the great proprietor of the county, the Duke of Buccleuch, whose influence has not, we believe, been successfully resisted before. Great exertions were made to repel this attack on a great Jingo stronghold, including the creation of small freeholds or "faggot votes" in considerable numbers, which Mr. Gladstone's supporters met by running up small houses for workingmen. The enthusiasm his candidacy roused and his own torrent of eloquence carried the day, though only by about 200 votes. The city of London, in which the influence of "society" is now strong, remained with the Jingles; but that the best educated opinion of the country has continued sound was shown by Mr. Lowe's return again for the London University, a constituency in some respects unequalled anywhere. The many friends in this country of Professor Bryce, the author of the 'History of the Holy Roman Empire,' will be glad to hear of his return for the Tower Hamlets, a London borough which he and his colleague have wrested from the Jingles by a heavy majority. The election is the most important one which has occurred in England since the passage of the Reform Bill, and is likely to be far-reaching in its consequences, and strengthen the friends of pure popular government all over the world.

Mr. Gladstone has declared that he will not take office again, and will undoubtedly keep his word. Even, however, if he were disposed to reconsider, some obscure personal dislike of him entertained by the Queen would make his re-entrance into office a matter of difficulty and embarrassment. The new Ministry will probably be formed by Lord Granville, and led in the Commons by the Marquis of Hartington. Sir William Harcourt will probably this time enter the Cabinet, but it is difficult to see how Sir Charles Dilke can, considering his agitation about the cost of royalty a few years ago.

Mr. Parnell, whose ardor seems to have been in no way abated by the rough handling he received in Enniscorthy, went down to Cork at the last moment and there, in spite of the protests of the Catholic clergy, flung himself into the contest with a nominee of his own named Daly, and beat a Conservative and Liberal by small majorities. He took occasion while there to announce that his hostility to the Whigs was just as great as his hostility to the Tories, and that arrangements for coercing them were just as needful. This is an old tradition of Irish politics. O'Connell's favorite epithet for the Whigs was "base, brutal, and bloody," and his followers and successors have always been much more vituperative towards them than towards the Tories, and have, apparently as a consequence, got office from them much more frequently. There is a rumor, which it is to be hoped is true, that the Liberals mean to offer the Chief-Secretaryship for Ireland to the O'Connor Don. One of the irritating practices of English party politics has been the rule of giving this place to an Englishman, and usually an English-

man more than usually ignorant of Irish affairs. Under the Beaconsfield government Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, a Gloucestershire squire, held it for a while, and it is now held by another Englishman, Mr. Lowther, who has just been defeated at York. He made at the close of the session a speech on Irish grievances of the most exasperating kind, and full of insult and menace against the bulk of the Irish people—the kind of speech, in short, which has for a century past done much to make Ireland ungovernable.

Lord Lytton will now promptly come home from India. In fact he is said to have forestalled the dismissal which he knew awaited him if the Liberals succeeded, by placing his resignation in Lord Beaconsfield's hands, to take effect absolutely on that event. This was made inevitable by the Marquis of Hartington's declaration in the House of Commons a year ago that he (Lord Lytton) was "the very embodiment of all that a Governor-General of India ought not to be," and that the first duty of the Government was to recall him. He was sent out to start the "imperial policy" and pick a quarrel for that purpose with Shir Ali, and he displayed as much enthusiasm for "the gates of India" and "the scientific frontier" as his chief and brother novelist. Sir Henry Layard will doubtless also be promptly recalled. He has not only made himself a rabid friend of the Turks, but has associated himself in a very unseemly manner with the quarrels of the Ministry at home by forwarding slanderous stories about Mr. Gladstone, for which, their falsity having been thoroughly proved, he refused to apologize. He has probably done more than any other man to get the Tories into their Turkish embarrassment by his hopeful views of Ottoman rule, although no more searching exposures of its incurable rottenness are to be found anywhere than in his books in his better days as a traveller and explorer.

Prince Bismarck has resigned the Chancellorship of the Empire owing to a quarrel with the Bundesrath, or Federal Council, over a proposal to impose a stamp duty on the receipts for postal money-orders. This was defeated by a vote of 30 to 28, the former representing 7,500,000 of population and the latter 30,000,000. The Bundesrath corresponds somewhat in composition and functions to our Senate, except that in fixing the number of representatives from each state some account has been taken of difference of population. The large states have several (Prussia 17), but every state, however small, has one, and the representatives of each state are obliged to vote as a unit; a state, too, need only send one representative to cast all its votes. The Prince has thus been beaten by a combination of the small states, and insists on retiring in spite of the Emperor's refusal to accept his resignation. He pleads ill-health as a reason for his persistence, besides the bad behavior of the Bundesrath; but it is probably ill-health which makes the behavior of the Bundesrath seem so bad. There can be little doubt that means will be found to make the Bundesrath give way, but it is also probable that the Chancellor's retirement from active service is not far distant. The Emperor may go any day, and the Crown Prince does not rely on the Chancellor greatly, and there is every reason, therefore, why the latter should wish to retire while he can do so with undoubted dignity.

Prince Napoleon has made the oddest stroke of his eccentric career by publishing a letter supporting the decrees against the religious orders, on the ground that these decrees are in accordance with Napoleonic principles and traditions, and, therefore, even if they do come from the hands of the enemies of religion and morality, he cannot conscientiously oppose them. The Republicans are naturally delighted with the letter, both as an approval of their policy and a sign of the confusion in the Bonapartist camp, while it has filled the Bonapartists with dismay, as it practically amounts to their desertion by their own chief. The Bonapartism of the First Empire was an openly cynical and sceptical affair, which made no secret of regarding the Church as a department of police; but the modern edition professes to be pious, reads its *Heures* punctually, and rolls its eyes over the infidels with as much unction as the Legitimists.

## MR. EDMUNDS ON THE SUPERVISION OF ELECTIONS.

MR. EDMUNDS'S speech on the Deficiency Bill appropriating the back pay for the United States marshals, and changing the mode of appointing the deputy marshals, might be ascribed to what some people consider the over-critical temper which he carries into debate, if it had not been supported by the vote of the party in the Senate. This may be said to make it the expression of the party view of the Democratic amendment of the law, for he does not appear to have laid much stress on the objection that this amendment is in the form of a rider to an appropriation bill. His chief ground of opposition was that the object of the Democrats was really to get rid of *all* the guarantees for fair elections now supplied by Federal legislation, and that the proposed change in the mode of appointing the marshals would aid them in attaining this object, inasmuch as deputy-marshals appointed by the courts could not be subject to the discipline and control of the executive branch of the Government. He made no mention of, and seemed to attach no importance to, the abuses which have been proved in the present mode of appointment, and in the way in which the deputy-marshals discharged their duties. His position, in short, seemed to be that *any* law passed by the Republican party for securing the purity of elections is praiseworthy, that *any* machinery created by it is respectable and more efficient than anything that Democrats are likely to substitute, and that Democratic complaints about its operation are not to be heeded, because they in all probability are a mere cloak for hostility to any legal protection for voters.

This mode of meeting the Democrats, if it came from any one who made railing at them his principal work, would hardly call for comment. But coming at this late date from a man who stands deservedly as high in the Republican party as Mr. Edmunds stands, and from one who pays so much attention to the serious business of legislation as he does, it has real gravity. It amounts to proposing in effect that all Republican action should be based on the theory that the Democrats are public enemies, and that anything they propose, however fair its outward seeming, may and ought to be treated as an attack on the Government of the country. This is the old Republican theory of the war period, it is true, and it may have been necessary to act on this theory in war-time; but the war is over, and has ended in a renewed attempt to carry on a free government in conjunction with the Democrats. In other words, instead of fighting the Democrats in the field, the Republicans are now engaged in co-operation with them for the maintenance of a Republic on this continent.

The way of looking at them, therefore, which was perhaps proper and necessary while fighting them in the field, is clearly out of place on the part of those who are working with them for a common end in the forum. They are not a small set or faction, either, whose feelings and opinions may be disregarded when attacking any great national problem, or whose excesses may be curbed by exceptional legislation. They comprise fully half the voting population, and if not the more intelligent and enlightened half, probably the more energetic and active. They cannot, therefore, be got rid of or put down by force. In order to make this Government succeed, especially in the Republican sense of success, they must be consulted and conciliated and won over. The talk of dealing with them by means of a "strong man" is too silly for serious discussion. They are not collected in one corner of the Union, as the slaveholders were in the late war, to be marched against with infantry, cavalry, and artillery. They are about half the people of every State at the North. It is, therefore, not simply desirable but absolutely essential that, whatever any man's opinions about their designs may be, the work of national legislation should be conducted on the assumption that they mean the public good, and are amenable to persuasion and convinceable by experiment. This assumption may break down frequently in practice, and a thousand facts may every week be adduced which tell against it, and yet it has to be clung to by every man calling himself a statesman as our only defence against "Mexicanism." It is the inability of

the Mexican mind to lay hold of this assumption which makes the Mexican Republic the abortion that it is. It is the difficulty which the French mind has had in laying hold of it which has filled the last century of French history with revolutions, and still makes the future of republican government in France uncertain.

Now, applying all this to this matter of the supervision of the Federal elections, it is obvious that the hostility of the Democrats to fair elections—supposing it to be as deep-seated and as wide-spread as their worst enemies believe—is either conquerable or unconquerable. If it be unconquerable, if half the American people like to see elections carried by fraud and violence, and cannot be in any manner taught the more excellent way, of course free government on this continent is a failure, and we have only to wait patiently until things become bad enough to bring in the Caesar who will get rid of electoral corruption by getting rid of elections altogether. But if it be conquerable, is it conquerable in any other way than by opposing reason to unreason, moderation to violence, legality to illegality, fairness to unscrupulousness? Is not the result of meeting violence by fraud, or fraud by fraud, perfectly well known? Is there any record of it ever having, under any circumstances, led to purity and peace? Is there any arrangement in the moral order of the universe by which the reign of justice can be established by mutual cheating? It is not denied and cannot be denied that the present mode of appointing deputy-marshals on election day has been marked by gross abuses. The law under which they are appointed applies only to cities of over 20,000 inhabitants, and by far the larger number of such cities are to be found at the North. The United States marshals who appoint these deputies for service on election day are always strong partisans, and, in fact, generally receive their own places for strong partisanship. It has been proved that in a very large number of cases the deputies selected by them have been persons of the worst character, who do the dirty work of ward politics—keepers of grog-shops and of houses of prostitution, pugilists, gamblers, and in many instances discharged convicts and drunkards. If these men were on election day held together as a police force under a commanding officer with disciplinary powers, it might perhaps be said that their moral character and antecedents were of no consequence. But they are not when on duty under anybody's control. The authority of the marshal over them, even if he could look after them, is merely nominal, for they are only hired for the day, and the only penalty that could be inflicted on them is dismissal. They stand around the polls virtually as independent agents, and actually have the right of arresting without warrant any man whom they choose to accuse of offering a fraudulent vote, and carrying him off in custody. Now, even if this power had never been abused—and it *has* been abused, though not as often as Democratic politicians pretend—and even if it be a power which ought to be lodged in some officer present at the polls, it is against natural justice to lodge it in the hands of a partisan, no matter how good his character, and grossly indecent to lodge it in the hands of a partisan of no character at all. It may be that the Democratic plan of having these men appointed by the judges of the Circuit Court is, as Mr. Edmunds pointed out, a faulty one, and it may be that the phrase "good moral character" is a loose one; but surely he ought to have admitted that some change was desirable, even if the one proposed was not, and that no difficulty in defining "a good moral character" ought to stand in the way of improving the character of the deputy-marshals, as it has stood hitherto. One may not be always able to say what constitutes a really good man, but every one knows that a thief or keeper of a house of ill-fame, or a drunkard or gambler, is, *ipso facto*, unfit to hold office under a Christian government even for a day, and unfit to exercise the power of arresting any man without warrant, and that the machinery which puts such men in office needs alteration.

The notion which seems to have run through Mr. Edmunds's speech, that machinery of this kind, however bad it may be, is good enough for the Democrats, is one which, useful as it may sometimes prove in sweetening the malignity of a private quarrel, has no place in statesmanship. It is, nevertheless, one of the usual



sequelæ of a civil war, and we fear reconciled a good many people at the North to the abuses of the carpet-bag régime at the South. But there is no room for it in civilized government in our time. It is no part of a statesman's duty to "pay off" anybody or "get even with" him, or hoist him with his own petard. It is a cardinal rule of modern politics that no man can ever lose his right to good government. Even when in jail for crime his title to justice and fair dealing is in no way shaken by the atrocity of his offences. No matter how corrupt the Democrats may be, no matter how ready to accomplish their ends by fraud, no matter how hostile to the political ideal which the Republican party cherishes, their claim to have elections conducted by their opponents with all the guaranties for impartiality which would be exacted in a private transaction remains unshaken. Unless the theory of the American Government is a huge mistake, the only way to reduce or put an end to Democratic wickedness and restore the old love of honest voting and honest counting, is to leave no man fair grounds for suspecting or alleging that the party in power does not desire honest voting and honest counting. In other words, the only remedy for dishonesty is honesty, and for corruption, purity; and in politics, as in law, it must be remembered it is not enough to be honest or pure—you must so act that no man shall have reason to doubt that you are honest and pure.

We cannot help feeling that the Republican mode of dealing with this question in the Senate will increase the number of those who believe that the Bourbonism of the party is in many ways more objectionable than that of the Democrats; that the implacability of temper handed down to it by the war, and which some of its members cherish as a gift of the God of Peace, has unfitted it for constructive statesmanship, and that nothing short of its complete expulsion from power will purify the political atmosphere. The number of adherents who are lost to it from this view may in any one year be small, but no one can deny that it is every year a perceptible quantity, and that in one way or another the hold of the party on every State in the Union has come to be very slight even in times of excitement. Its majorities everywhere are now very small, and nothing will increase them but some policy that will, as when the party was founded, touch the springs of moral enthusiasm. A game of tricks and counter-tricks with the Democrats, however successful, is hardly likely to do this. Nor are people who seek moral foundations for their politics likely to be well pleased with the total ignoring in Mr. Edmunds's speech of the important bearing which this supervision of elections by the general Government has on the question of a non-partisan civil service. It is simply preposterous to ask any party out of power to accept calmly the doctrine that elections are sure to be pure if watched by functionaries appointed as United States marshals are now appointed, and who, like these functionaries, are dependent for their places on the result of the election.

#### THE BRITISH ELECTIONS.

IT is at first sight difficult to account for the surprise which the result of the elections in England has created even among the best English observers. Neither Conservatives nor Liberals seem to have been at all prepared for it. We know that the Liberals themselves were very despondent up to the dissolution of Parliament, and the Tories were satisfied that their prospects were decidedly better than they were a year ago. It was, in fact, a current belief among the Tories, and found expression on the stump immediately before the election, that Mr. Gladstone's speeches were actually helping them; and some went so far as to say that if he kept on talking in the same vein to the end it would give them most of the boroughs and all the counties. Lord Beaconsfield undoubtedly took this view of his rival's eloquence, and the confidence he felt was fully displayed in his letter to the Duke of Marlborough, which was published as an electioneering manifesto. In it he did not even think it necessary to explain what his policy was. He simply declared that in order to save the Empire from dissolution

and maintain the "ascendency" of England in the councils of Europe it was necessary to keep him in power. Sir William Harcourt was, indeed, if we remember rightly, the only prominent speaker on the Liberal side who ventured to predict confidently that the Ministry would be overthrown by a general election. The Tory speakers, as a rule, took no pains to conceal their contempt for efforts made to oust them. The Liberals were treated as a body rent by dissensions, and thoroughly discredited even in the eyes of the moderate men of their own party, and, although they might achieve some success in Scotland and Ireland, they had alienated the English public. The *Pall Mall Gazette* up to the last represented the secession of the Moderates as having already occurred, or as being sure to show itself at the election on a great scale, and the *Times*, in an article which appeared since the dissolution, apropos of Mr. Gladstone's Scotch speeches, expressed great anxiety lest the Liberals should not command sufficient strength in the new Parliament even to perform the duties of a respectable opposition.

This ignorance or uncertainty about the state of the public mind was probably due to a variety of causes. In London, where the press is largely influenced by "society," Mr. Gladstone appeared to be the embodiment of the Liberal party, and it therefore became the object of the dislike and distrust which he had excited in the class which sets the tone in the clubs, and which was disgusted by his enthusiasm, his indiscretions, and his volubility both with pen and tongue. The Court, too, which is now, owing to the size of the royal family, an unusually potent element in society, had set its face against him for a variety of reasons and lavished its favors without stint on Lord Beaconsfield, who was visited in his country-house both by the Queen and the Prince of Wales with somewhat ostentatious favor. The Army was immensely tickled by the "imperial policy" as promising active service, and giving increased weight to military considerations and questions. So that altogether the social world of London appears to have come to look on the greatest Englishman of our time as in some sort a dangerous and unsound person, and to have concluded that it was impossible that a majority of English voters could at a critical season entrust with power a party which was under his guidance or likely to take its inspiration from him. In the provinces, and especially in the North of England, where the newspapers are more directly exposed to popular influence, there was by no means the same confidence in Liberal weakness; but there was, nevertheless, no assurance of victory. The best explanation of the mystery perhaps, after all, lies in the fact that the constituencies have greatly changed, not only since 1868 but since 1874. It was in 1874 that household suffrage first came into the field, and it is reasonable to suppose that the voters it had created were still unconscious of their own power, unused to forming political judgments, and still under the influence of the middle and upper classes, who, in that year, furiously revolted against Mr. Gladstone, whose reforms had wearied and alarmed them. Since 1874 these voters have probably got more into the way of making up their own minds in politics, and then there are more of them. The votes cast have increased since that year by nearly half a million, and the recent additions clearly form a quantity which electioneering agents and political prophets and wire-pullers seem to have known very little about, and to have supposed to be as much pleased with the imperial policy as "their betters." But no explanation can make the miscalculations of all the leading organs of public opinion anything but a very singular phenomenon.

The unexpectedness of what has happened of course goes far to make all speculation about the past idle; but there is, nevertheless, apparently good reason for thinking that if Beaconsfield had dissolved Parliament and gone to the country in the first stage of his foreign policy, after his triumphal return from Berlin, he might have obtained a new lease of power. The programme he then produced was very brilliant, and imposed for the moment on a good many Liberals. The public fancy was touched by the acquisition of Cyprus, about which people knew nothing but what Beaconsfield, who knew nothing himself, told them. The protectorate of Asia Minor seemed a splendid responsibility and one suited to Eng-

lish genius and traditions, and even the arrival of the seven thousand Sepoys at Malta was looked on as a master-stroke. The Salisbury-Shuvaloff Secret Memorandum, to be sure, was an unpleasant circumstance, but it was overlooked or forgotten in what seemed to be the great triumph of Berlin, which the Queen recognized by giving the two British negotiators the Garter, and the leading Conservative noblemen and gentlemen by giving the Premier a great dinner, at which the Duke of Buccleuch presided. At that dinner Lord Beaconsfield probably passed the happiest hours of his life. He had his blue ribbon on, he was surrounded by his brother peers in the character of the savior of England, and in his intoxication he poured forth a flood of haughty vituperation on Gladstone as "the verbose rhetorician" who had dared to doubt the competency of a company of "English gentlemen" like himself and his Cabinet to manage the affairs of the nation. From that moment there was a steady decline in the position of the Ministry. The value of Cyprus as a "place of arms" began to be found out. The Treaty of Berlin was read more critically and found really to take more from Turkey than it took from Russia. The responsibility assumed by the Anglo-Turkish Convention, which made the Turkish line in Asia Minor a British frontier, was seen to be an enormous one for a non-military power to assume, for of course the fleet could not manœuvre in the Armenian mountains. Then came also the abortion of the attempt to convert Afghanistan into a "strong, friendly, and independent power," and the resolute refusal of the Turks to "reform," as by the Convention they had bound themselves to do.

These things, it is fair to believe, would have had a disastrous influence on the prestige of the Ministry, even if his picturesque foreign policy had been the only attractive feature in Lord Beaconsfield's play-bill. But he had added to it also a scheme for effecting a considerable but ill-defined change, not exactly in the structure, but in the working of the British Government, which he foreshadowed in one of his early novels, under the sounding title of "The Monarch and the Multitude." This change, which is illustrated by the way in which he kept Parliament in the dark about his designs abroad until they had been actually carried into execution, consisted in a kind of reversion to the Elizabethan type of constitutional monarchy, in which the great affairs of state were settled by the sovereign and a small council of ministers, subject, however, to a general power of complaint and discussion, though hardly of ratification, on the part of the House of Commons. That he had such a change in view was not simply an inference from his high-handed way of committing the nation to responsibilities abroad. Its necessity was openly expounded in the Tory press by prominent writers, who represented the House of Commons as having fallen, under various influences, into a sort of by no means venerable decrepitude, and "the multitude" as looking eagerly and justifiably to "the monarch" and her counsellor for the legislation as well as the administration which their interests required. The gravity, not to say solemnity, and the minuteness of illustration with which this theory was set forth and Lord Beaconsfield made to figure as a sort of remodeller of the British Constitution have now, in the light of the late election, an almost ludicrous air. That he should have got men of acknowledged intellectual and social weight to produce him in this character must always remain one of the most striking incidents of his extraordinary career.

That career is now closed. Lord Beaconsfield will doubtless never hold office again; and considering the stir he has made and the airs of political authority he has assumed, there is something really marvellous in the fact that, though he has been over forty years in public life, he had only held office for six years, at different periods, and had acquired no distinction whatever, except as a novelist and epigrammatic debater, when in 1876 he undertook to regulate the affairs of Europe and redistribute the sovereignty in the British Government. His failure in the last stage of his enterprise has been so complete, and has taken him so suddenly, that it will probably make the earlier stage seem more absurd, and even ridiculous, than it really was. It would be unfair to throw on him alone the

responsibility of his strange, eventful history. He could not have cut the figure he did if the conditions of his success had not existed in Tory society and manners. If Tory culture had not prepared the party for the leadership of a charlatan, a charlatan would never have led it. And whenever the story of Lord Beaconsfield's hold on the Tory imagination is told for a reproach, it must also be told for a still greater reproach that during the period when they were helping their theatrical chief to amuse himself by arranging the great powers of the British Empire in tableaux, the Englishman whose genius had made the most beneficent and striking contributions of the last fifty years to the statute-book, and whose speeches alone maintained the great traditions of English oratory, was the main object of their ridicule and vituperation. There is one feature about the election which may almost be called pathetic. The area of the globe over which the result was looked for with eager anxiety was, of course, very great, and illustrates strikingly the vastness of the Empire. But what gives a touch of splendor to the Liberal victory is that whole races in the East have seen it as a great light. To every Christian still groaning under Turkish rule it means speedy help and deliverance. To the Christians lately emancipated and to the Greeks it means the consolidation and maintenance of their freedom and independence. To the Hindus it means government for their own sake and not for the gratification of foreign pride. For the Afghans it means a cessation of pillage and slaughter in aid of a "scientific frontier." To the Turk it means that he must be clean and honest and industrious or die. These things must sweeten their triumph to the English Liberals, and would make it precious even if they did not know that it had probably put an end to the last effort that will ever be made on English soil to set up personal government and restore the mystery of statecraft.

#### FUTURE CIVIL-RIGHTS CASES.

MAY, 1880.—An interesting phase of the Civil-Rights question, based on the recent rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, has just been presented in Chicago. The Supreme Court of Illinois, as will be remembered, ruled in April last that it was in the power of local school-boards to make obligatory the reading of the Bible in the public schools. The effect of this has been to deprive the Roman Catholic population of Illinois of the right to education in the public schools, which they are taxed largely to support. An application has just been granted, in the United States Circuit Court in Chicago, to remove this case into that court. "Every man," said the learned judge presiding in the Circuit Court, "has a right to an equal enjoyment of the privileges of education for which he is taxed; and to abridge this right is an invasion of the Fourteenth Amendment." A similar ruling has just been made in the United States Circuit Court in Alabama. A State law providing that colored children should have separate schools allotted to them has been held unconstitutional. "What right," said the circuit judge, "has a State legislature to make any discrimination against any class or sect?"

September, 1880.—A late decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio, to the effect that compulsory reading of the Bible in the public schools must be abandoned, has just been reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States. "Have not Protestant Christians," argued Mr. Justice Strong, giving the opinion of the court, "their rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, believing, as they do, that the Bible is the basis of education; and can they be constitutionally deprived of these rights in a State where their money goes to supply three-fourths of the expenses of these schools?" It had been objected, on the argument, that this position was inconsistent with a late ruling in Chicago, by the United States Circuit Court there sitting, to the effect that reading the Bible in the schools could not be constitutionally enforced, as the effect was to impair the civil rights of the Roman Catholics. But this objection was triumphantly refuted by Judge Strong. "It proves," he said in the course of his opinion, "that under the Fourteenth Amendment the rights of no class in the community can be invaded, and that the Fourteenth Amendment, as it was lately remarked by a distinguished Federal judge in Virginia (Rives, J.), in fact as well as in theory, proclaims liberty throughout the land. It might indeed be argued that this breaks up the schools, since they cannot at the same time read and not read the Bible. The objection, however, is irre-



levant; and if the schools interfere with civil rights, so much the worse for the schools."

December, 1880.—Two interesting cases of contempt have just come up at Columbia S. C., before Judge Bond. A Jew, summoned as a juror, was committed by a State court because he declined to sit on Saturday, and, on being brought into court on attachment, closed his ears with cotton, informing the judge that he did not mean to listen to a word that was said. On the same day a witness, claiming to be an atheist, was committed for contempt in refusing to be sworn. Both parties were immediately released on *habeas corpus* by Judge Bond.

January, 1881.—Great excitement, which the Federal marshals, though aided by the military arm of the Government, have had great difficulty in suppressing, has been felt in Boston at the trial of Chief-Justice Gray before Judge Clifford, sitting with a jury in the United States Circuit Court. The Legislature of Massachusetts, it will be recollected, had passed a statute providing that no persons having constitutional scruples as to death punishment should sit on juries in capital cases. Two respectable sects, the Shakers and the Quakers, hold such scruples; and the question of the constitutionality of the statute excluding them was brought last week before Chief-Justice Gray and Judge Morton in the case of *Com. v. Jones*, the defendant being a Shaker indicted for murder. Notwithstanding a learned argument by the U. S. District Attorney, intervening on the part of the United States, to the effect that the Fourteenth Amendment gave Shakers a right to be summoned on juries, and that a State statute excluding them was unconstitutional, the Chief-Justice overruled a motion to quash the array made by the defendant, and ordered the case to be placed on the trial list for the next day. A warrant, however, was instantly issued, as is well known, for the arrest of Chief-Justice Gray, and he was subsequently bound over by a Federal commissioner for trial. The trial took place yesterday, and occupied but a few hours. The jurors, having been summoned by the marshal from persons friendly to the Government and to the due enforcement of civil rights, were challenged by the defendant on the ground that it was a strange way of enforcing civil rights to select jurors from one party alone; but the challenge was overruled by the court. The evidence occupied only half an hour, consisting simply of the fact that the defendant, as charged in the indictment, had refused to quash an array of jurors from which Shakers had been excluded. Judge Clifford, in charging the jury, told them that the questions of law raised by the defendant had already been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, in March, 1880, in *Cole's case*; *Cole* being a Virginia judge who, in obedience to a State law, had refused to quash a jury from which colored men had been excluded. Judge Clifford further said that he had dissented, as was well known, from the decision in *Cole's case*, but that now, sitting on circuit, he was bound to carry out the decision of the majority of the court. It was alleged by the defendant in the present case that what he did was in the exercise of his judicial discretion as Chief-Justice of Massachusetts. This point had been taken in *Cole's case*, so Judge Clifford said in his charge, and had been overruled by the Supreme Court. After the rulings of the Supreme Court in *Cole's case*, so he went on to tell the jury, there was nothing for them to do but convict, which they accordingly did somewhat promptly. The defendant was sentenced to be imprisoned for thirty days, with the statement that as this was a first offence it was to be regarded with comparative leniency, but that any subsequent misconduct of the same class would be much more severely punished.

#### THE AMERICAN GIRL.

IT is probable that when the American novel comes to be written, as in the due course of evolution must finally happen, the American girl will figure in it with importance. She has the two-fold advantage of being of much intrinsic interest, and of having remained hitherto for the most part unexploited. The fact that she has been so much neglected is a little remarkable; but it is mainly due, we imagine, to the absence of any suspicion in our writers of fiction that she differs in any respect from her foreign analogues. Either they have depicted her after the model mirrored in their own imaginations, instead of reconstructing her from the results of observation, or they have given us individual portraits here and there which, however admirable in themselves, have not the force of generalizations that might portray a national type. Mr. Howells is by far the best instance of the latter method; a very delightful bery of maidens might be made up from his books first and last; but Mr. Howells seems to be concerned chiefly with the genus rather than

with the American species, to be versed and interested in girls as girls instead of in American girls as such, even when he does not go to the other extreme and show us in Kitty Ellison the Ohio girl, or the South Bradfield girl in Miss Lydia Blood. It is complimentary to be thus assured of variety, but all the same a large field is left unexplored. Mr. James, to be sure, has made several incursions into this, with, if not especially complimentary, certainly most interesting results; he has, however, either from diffidence or because it was easiest, confined himself to the drawing of silhouettes, as it were, against the strongly-contrasted background of European society, and the extremely piquant features disclosed are after all only those defined by the juxtaposition. At the best Mr. James's treatment cannot be called exhaustive; he has made various studies of a certain *pece*, and the sitter is so rounded and complete and distinct that she is worthy of a finished portrait.

She is, nevertheless, of comparatively recent growth, and with all her definiteness is characterized by a bewildering complexity designed to baffle the acutest novelist's scrutiny, so that as the profession of novel writing is also young with us, and still alloyed with other literary effort, the explanation of her neglect is perhaps not difficult. Twenty or thirty years ago she did not exist even in New England, and in Indiana it is doubtful if she exists to-day. But no society develops so rapidly as a new one without the drawbacks of barbarism, and it is already clear that the general tendency is towards her; that, as a rule, her ranks will have more recruits than deserters; that she has won the present and has not yet, to all appearances, "lost the future." She is the product—wholly natural, it must be admitted—of two of the things we prize most, personal independence, namely, and education. The latter of these enhances, if it does not involve, the other; and since our girls have begun to receive the same education as boys there has grown up in them an imperious desire for independence and the personal dignity it carries with it, which is, perhaps, the distinguishing trait of the best of them. Girls are now in general as well educated as the youth of the other sex—or, at least, are rapidly coming to be—in everything that is a requisite for intellectual equality in the social sphere wherein they have relations to each other. As this condition of things is in this country a new one, however, it has various complications whose effect on character is noteworthy and evident. The mother of the American girl, or, at all events, her grandmother, in six cases out of ten, finished her education at the district school, and betook herself to housekeeping of a kind, and child-bearing on a scale, now grown indisputably antiquated. "Such women are beginning to become rare," writes Turgeneff of his charming Arina Vlassievna; adding, "God knows whether we ought to rejoice at it." Whether we rejoice or not is, perhaps, unimportant. They have with us become impossible, and, whatever the American girl ultimately becomes, it is certain that retrogression is out of the question. It is out of the question that she should "count" as little or in precisely the same way as her mother has done.

Men are beginning to see this, but they have come to it rather tardily and timorously, and for this reason women have been compelled to force it on their attention. This has involved self-assertion, without which it is clear personal independence can never be won, although it may be quite needless to the maintenance of it when once attained. Self-assertion, however, has its drawbacks, and the wonder is that the American girl has been able to reconcile it with so many agreeable qualities; for the necessity of making good one's position is always an awkward one, and pioneers of any sort are handicapped with self-consciousness. Self-consciousness, in fact, is a prominent characteristic of the American girl—self-consciousness with all the miseries it involves, which, nevertheless, she contrives to endure with admirable heroism. Having no force of matured public opinion to rely upon, no social conventions that are the outgrowth of long development to regulate her life so far as to save her the necessity of looking before every leap, she is inevitably driven in upon herself. Her mind is naturally far more occupied with rights than with duties—except, of course, those set down in the decalogue. Her claims altogether transcend her concessions. If she were in the least introspective—which, with all her self-consciousness, she is very far from being—she would perceive that she measures other people by a standard considerably higher than her own. Without being in the least conceited, being, on the contrary, extremely diffident and exasperatedly conscious of it, her vanity is something abnormal. Constant justification of her position rivets her attention upon her success or failure, and what is called "effect" becomes of singular importance to her. How imminent is the peril of shallowness her lack of introspection prevents her from discerning. The possession of hitherto forbidden fruit is so delightful that she is frequently content with its fragrance and leaves

it untasted. The number of entirely serious American girls who have within the decade made an acquaintance with literature, *bric-à-brac*, art, music, and even science, in quick succession, merely to increase their stores of social ammunition, is, we suspect, very large. To know a Corot or a Boldini when they see it, to tell a Japanese vase from a Chinese, to be familiar with the names of different orchestral instruments, with the controversy between Mr. Tyndall and Dr. Martineau, and so on, is in itself so grateful as to be satisfying. This is, moreover, the antipodes of pedantry. It is perhaps not quite sincere enough to be pedantic. Nothing is more disagreeable to the American girl than the idea of a "blue-stocking." Cant allusions to "the strong-minded" by unimaginative young men she regards as a trifle coarse and wholly inapplicable. For what are called "the rights of woman" she cares nothing; it is her personal importance that concerns her. She does not want a vote—though she has a conviction that women of property should be allowed a voice upon questions of taxation—but her anxiety to "count" as a "person" approaches intensity.

From all this it is possible to conclude that the American novel might do worse upon the whole than to take a suggestion from Turgeneff and treat of 'Mothers and Daughters'; just now in America this conflict seems to bear an analogy to the conflict of 'Fathers and Sons' in Russia. In both instances tradition has lost its sanctions for the younger generations, and what has so far been substituted for it is in a state of flux, promising or not as one likes, but undeniably picturesque. Who has not witnessed the loving contempt the better sort of American girls display for their mothers, and the affectionate jealousy with which these in turn contemplate their successors? The two are come to have scarcely an intellectual sympathy in common; the acquirements of the one are yet too recent to be leavened with toleration, and the arrogance inseparable from their rawness is keenly resented by the other. No small part of the family conversation in many homes is probably made up on the one hand of laments over the "doings" of "these days," and on the other of protest against the unreasonable impossibility of putting young heads on old shoulders. The result is never in doubt: it is the resignation of age on the one side and the irritability of youth on the other. And the latter certainly is outspoken. The American girl honors the fifth commandment scrupulously, but she does not decorate it. For social conventions, having outgrown obsolete conditions, she has precisely the respect they seem to her to merit; and it must be admitted that her examination of their deserts is to the last degree conscientious. Secure in two natural qualities in which she has possibly no equal the world over, good sense, namely, and integrity, she may with more impunity than most treat them as surplusage. Only the delicacy, the charm, the fine flavor which comes of itself by the mere unquestioning following of conventions is apt to elude the best directed efforts of even feminine logic; to make the world over something besides integrity and good sense is necessary, and the American girl would undeniably like to have the world made over again in two respects: she would like to have the world's distinction between young girls and married women obliterated, and she would like to be judged by her intentions instead of by her conduct, both of which desires are notoriously in the teeth of conventions. Unhappily for the gratification of the former wish, the world has decided that the *ingénue* quality is too attractive in a young girl to permit her to know anything of one-half of life. The American girl chafes at this; her curiosity is piqued; and, since to her enquiry as to why knowledge of any sort is hurtful to any one, it is impossible for even her mother to make any reply, she concludes there is nothing in it; which would be all very well if she did not act accordingly. As it is, though only a German would argue from her exercise of her right to do as she likes that she "has carefully elaborated a system of licentious behavior"—a Teutonic induction from a Bangor young lady's conduct in Mr. James's 'A Bundle of Letters,' it may be remembered—it causes people to make allowances for her, which is fatal to her position as a "person." To gratify the other wish is equally fatal to this and equally difficult to do. Most people do not understand her request to be granted the consideration of an adult together with the impunity of a child; on the contrary, they misunderstand her, which is always the more unfortunate for the misunderstood. They esteem her inconsiderateness selfishness, for example, which it is not at all; and it is she who suffers. When people are too much perplexed they become indifferent; the game is not worth the candle, the world being sordid.

What makes it a singularly difficult thing, moreover, to judge her by her intentions solely is a certain unconquerable incapacity of expression that infallibly characterizes her. This is wholly feminine, it may be said, and women have mistranslated their emotions in

speech and action with exasperating persistency since Eve. But in the American girl it is of a peculiar and exaggerated type. More invariably than any of her contemporaries she hoists the black flag when she sounds a parley. It is the reserve neither of instinct nor of principle, but of inability to be frank. The almost passionate worship of personal independence probably instils a distrust of frankness as implying, however faintly, a confession of weakness. Absolute personal independence is, of course, an impracticable ideal; but this can only be learned empirically, and of experience the American girl has none whatever. To the thousand obstacles in the way of her efforts to attain it she is obliged to oppose her only weapon of native tact. One's own supply of tact, however, is never adequate if it is unassisted by experience; fencing becomes necessary and finally habitual. Any one whose acquaintance with American girls is at all intimate must have had frequent experience of the suspiciousness, the almost morbid sensitiveness, the consequent wearisome "rallying" which marks the conversation of some of the gentlest and best disposed girls in the world, who it is all the time clear would be glad to get rid of it if they could. It may be that, as Carlyle says of "the dumb English," "the element of Shaksperian melody does lie imprisoned in their nature." The difficulty is that on really serious topics they are tongue-tied; and they take refuge in banter, with the result that men learn to expect nothing else of them. That aimless personal contest, that competition in which there is nothing at stake except the grateful avoidance of defeat, in which there is no real interest taken, which is never pursued as an art, and which is thus oftener brutal than brilliant, ensues. Nothing being so cruel as fear, and dread of defeat being omnipresent with her in this incessant conversational contest, the American girl is apt to say the bitterest things she "can lay her tongue to," as the phrase is, at the same time that she may be feeling kindest. Hence with no one is familiarity so dangerous and so likely to be abused. Her attitude is one of unconquerable hostility, based on diffidence and distrust; being essentially modest, it never occurs to her that she can wound or affront: being in constant fear of patronage which threatens her dignity, the complimentariness implied in familiarity seems satirical. If she is in doubt, she takes care to be on the safe side. It is probable that more incipient matrimony than we are apt to suspect gets nipped in the bud from the failure of her male correlative to understand this. It does not make him any wiser to assure him that she is, after all, more feminine than American, and that anybody but a fool would discern or divine her real feeling. She is altogether too much of a "person" for him to take such a liberty; no doubt, too, she would call it a "liberty" herself. This attitude, however, requires certain sacrifices; whether when she realizes these she will care to make them is still an open question.

#### MEMOIRS OF MME. DE RÉMUSAT.—VOL. III.

PARIS, March 19, 1880.

NAPOLÉON had never abandoned the project of his divorce from Josephine. We have represented him in 1807, holding his court at Fontainebleau, the arbiter of Europe and at the height of his power. He wanted nothing but an heir; he was establishing a new Empire with kings as his satellites; he was building, at least he thought so, for eternity; and everything hung upon the thread of his life. He sometimes spoke to Josephine of the death of young Napoleon, the son of Louis; of the delicate health of the other son of his brother—and hinted at the idea of a separation. He asked her once if she could not take the initiative, and save him the odium of a forced rupture:

"The Empress knew him too well to help him in this circumstance; she replied with calm and dignity that she would always obey his orders, but that she could do nothing more. 'Sire,' said she (for since his accession to the throne she had accustomed herself, even in *tête-à-tête*, to address him with ceremonious forms), 'you are the master and you will decide my fate. When you order me to leave the Tuileries I shall obey at once; but the least you can do is to give me a positive order. I am your wife; I have been crowned by you in the presence of the Pope; such honors cannot be voluntarily abandoned. If you divorce me France shall know that you turned me out, and shall not be ignorant of my obedience or of my profound sorrow.'

For a while the project of Napoleon was again abandoned, but Josephine became very uneasy, and her fears were such that she once allowed herself to say to Madame de Rémusat: "If I am too much in his way, who knows what he is capable of, and whether he would resist the wish to get rid of me?" to which Madame de Rémusat contented herself with replying: "Madame, be sure that he is not capable of going so far."



Two or three weeks before the end of the sojourn in Fontainebleau, Fouché, the Minister of the Police, arrived one morning and stayed a long time with the Emperor. Towards midnight everybody had retired: Madame de Rémusat was already in bed, when she was summoned by the Empress, and going immediately to her room found her dishevelled, half-dressed, and with her face quite *renversé*. She sent away her maids and showed her a long letter, signed Fouché. In this letter the Minister of the Police represented to her that the Emperor, who was now absolute master of France, owed something to the future of France. "It cannot be disguised," said the letter, "that the political future of France is compromised by the Emperor being deprived of an heir. As Minister of the Police I am well placed to know the state of public opinion, and I know that some uneasiness is felt about the succession of such an Empire." Fouché told the Empress that the affection of the Emperor for her did not allow him to propose a separation, and boldly asked her to make a courageous effort. He ended by saying that the Emperor did not know he was writing to her, and asked the Empress not to betray his confidence. Mme. de Rémusat at once judged that Fouché had done nothing except by the Emperor's order. She advised Josephine to go at once to the Emperor, to show him the letter, to express her anger to him, and to declare again that she would only obey a positive order which he should himself give. When Josephine showed the letter to Napoleon he affected great anger himself, said that he did not know what Fouché had done; that Fouché had now gone back to Paris, otherwise he would have scolded him. He was very affectionate and caressing; still, Josephine found him somewhat embarrassed.

The Rémusats had little affection for Fouché; they informed Talleyrand what had happened. Talleyrand heard quietly what they had to say, pronounced Fouché's letter ridiculous, and sent word to the Empress, through Madame de Rémusat, to answer Fouché haughtily that he should not meddle with matters which could only be treated without intermediaries. The Empress followed this advice; Talleyrand read her answer, but advised that it should be shown to the Emperor, who, said he, would not dare to disapprove it. Everything happened as he had said. Napoleon again affected much anger with Fouché, but asked his wife to forgive one who was so useful to him. When a week afterwards Fouché returned to Fontainebleau the Emperor took care to be a little cold with him, but Fouché did not seem to mind it in the least. Napoleon became more tender with Josephine than he had been for a long time; he often pressed her in his arms, sometimes declaring he never could live away from her. "In these scenes," says Madame de Rémusat, "first played intentionally, he slowly and involuntarily became animated, and he ended by being moved and softened *bona fide*."

Talleyrand seemed at that time really hostile to the divorce; he did not look on it as merely an "affaire de ménage." "There is nobody," he said to Madame de Rémusat, "in this palace who ought not to desire that Josephine should remain with Bonaparte; she is sweet-tempered, she is good; she knows the art of calming him; she enters into everybody's position. She is a refuge for us on many occasions. If we see a princess come here you will see the Emperor break with the whole court, and we shall be crushed." Still he often asked Madame de Rémusat what she would do if the Emperor divorced. She answered, without hesitation, that she would follow the fortunes of Josephine. She was attached to her, and, though she knew her to be "light and little susceptible of a prolonged affection," she would be faithful to her. "I entered this court through Madame Bonaparte; I have always passed before the world as her intimate friend; I have received her confidences, and though she has been often too preoccupied with her own position to amuse herself with loving me, the public, which cannot enter into the secret of our relations, and which shall not know it from me, would, I am sure, be surprised if I did not share her exile." Madame de Rémusat judged aright; it was quite evident that Napoleon would not have left her near a new empress, as she would have been for him a sort of living remorse. She did not affect to have a very deep affection for Josephine, who was herself very frivolous, very changeable, and incapable of any profound sentiment; still, she liked her, and she owed her much. Josephine had been uniformly kind to her, and had saved her and her husband almost from poverty.

It is a great pity that Madame de Rémusat does not in her 'Memoirs' give us the last act of the drama of the divorce. How interesting would it not have been to have from her the details of these historical scenes! She remained faithful to Josephine, as she had promised to do, though Queen Hortense herself tried to persuade her to remain at the Court. She had promised Josephine not to leave her, even if she were to quit France.

Sometimes Napoleon had hinted that his wife should always have a throne, perhaps at Rome itself. "When he spoke thus," says Madame de Rémusat, "the Pope was still in this same Rome, and nothing announced that he would have to leave it. But the gravest events seemed quite simple to Napoleon." We find no details about the divorce in the last volume of Madame de Rémusat; it seems as if she had not liked the concluding chapters of her court-life. We see in the notes that the Rémusats both fell into disgrace with Talleyrand, though M. de Rémusat kept his title and his functions of great-chamberlain. As for Madame de Rémusat, she had left the Court at the same time as Josephine. She went only once to the Tuileries, in order to be presented to the new Empress in great ceremony; she never saw the Emperor again till the end of 1812. The Duke of Friuli came to her and told her that Napoleon wished to see her, and he gave her the order to ask for an audience. She could not refuse; she asked for an audience, and was received. M. Paul de Rémusat, who tells this in the notes, says that he does not know what passed between Napoleon and his grandmother; he knows only that there was some question of Josephine's debts, and of some of her conversations. Josephine was always in debt, and Napoleon did not much mind her extravagance; so it seems to me probable that the visit must have had some object which Madame de Rémusat kept to herself. Josephine was at the time absent in Geneva, and Madame de Rémusat, to obey the orders of the Emperor, was obliged to write to her, and to give her advice which was to appear spontaneous, as the Emperor desired not to be named. This letter seems to have occasioned some *refroidissement* between Madame de Rémusat and the Empress Josephine.

It is interesting to know what were the feelings of Talleyrand in this great affair of the divorce. Fouché had made himself the ally of the Bonaparte family against the Beauharnais; he was induced to take this course by Madame Murat, who was very anxious to dethrone Josephine. Talleyrand was not absolutely hostile to the divorce, but he disliked and dreaded Fouché; he was anxious also to make of the divorce, if Bonaparte determined on it, a diplomatic instrument and power for France. Napoleon was leaning towards a Russian alliance, but Talleyrand knew that the Empress of Russia would not give one of her daughters to Bonaparte. The Spanish war was imminent, and Talleyrand, who was afraid of its consequences, took for a time the side of Madame Bonaparte. He denounced Fouché to Napoleon as a dangerous man:

"He is," said he, "and always will be the man of the revolution. Take care: it is by factious arts that he wishes to lead you to an act which requires a monarchical apparel [Fouché had hired some popular manifestations in favor of the divorce]. He wishes a mob, collected by his orders, to come and vociferate and ask for an heir with the same outcries that imposed on Louis XVI. I don't know what concessions, which he could never refuse. When you have accustomed the people to interfere in your affairs by such means, who knows but the people may acquire a taste for it, and what they will ask next?"

Napoleon was moved by these remarks; he was, besides, really attached to Josephine, who was the only charm of his interior life. There are curious and almost painful details in the last chapters of Madame de Rémusat on the emotions of Bonaparte, on his nervous state, his agitation: "My poor Josephine, I shall never be able to leave you." The terrible man, who felt unmoved on the battle-field and who played with the lives of men as a child plays with sand, cried easily; he loved and tormented his "little Creole"; he wished to see her covered with diamonds and to tear all her ornaments from her. He did leave her after all, and the 'Memoirs' of Metternich show that he regretted deeply the "folly" which he committed when he abandoned his first wife. The Archduchess Marie Louise was, in his thought, a tie between his dynasty and the old dynasties of Europe. He soon saw that she had only been sacrificed, like Iphigenia; that the old dynasties did not and could not forgive him; Marie Louise helped them and gave them a little breathing time, but the coalition had become inevitable and the days of the Empire were already numbered. The popular feeling in France justified the instincts of Bonaparte; even now you will find, among the peasants, the soldiers, the poor, a vague notion that Napoleon's luck was tied to the "bonne Joséphine," and that when he left her he signed his own condemnation.

## Notes.

CASSELL, PETTER & GALPIN will shortly bring out a new and cheaper edition of Fred. Barnard's 'Character Sketches from Charles Dickens,' in a handsome portfolio, large quarto size; also, 'Woman's

Work and Worth,' by W. H. Davenport Adams. —G. P. Putnam's Sons publish immediately, 'William Ellery Channing: His Opinions, Genius, and Character,' by the Rev. H. W. Bellows, and have in press Dinglestedt's romance, 'The Amazon,' translated by Prof. James Morgan Hart. —Still further availing himself of the Napoleon "boom" excited by the memoirs of Metternich and Mme. de Rémusat, Mr. W. J. Widdleton has followed up his reimpression of O'Meara's 'Napoleon in Exile' with a cheap edition in four volumes of Count de Las Cases's 'Memoirs of the Life, Exile, and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon.' —The editor of the *Magazine of American History* gives in the March number a very trenchant review of Benedict Arnold's career, apropos of his kinsman's late exculpatory memoirs. Incidentally he warmly defends Gates against his detractors. A steel portrait of Arnold accompanies the text. Several interesting illustrations occur in connection with a notice of the Chew family of Pennsylvania; and a chart of Newport and its defences in 1781, by one of Rochambeau's officers, is reproduced along with an easy translation of the author's diary. —In the April Johns Hopkins University Circular Dr. Wm. Hand Browne, the Librarian, enumerates with details the libraries of Baltimore, of which that of the Peabody Institute is the largest. The aggregate number of volumes accessible to readers is 197,450. —The fourth Cincinnati Biennial Musical Festival under the direction of Mr. Theodore Thomas is definitively announced for May 18, 19, 20, and 21. Beethoven's *Missa Solennis* will be repeated in conjunction with the *Symphony in C minor*. —The monthly review called the *Moliériste*, and edited by M. Georges Monval, the archivist of the *Comédie-Française* and historian of the *Odéon*, has reached the end of its first year, the twelfth (March) number containing an ample index to the proper names in the three hundred and seventy-five pages of the volume. The *Moliériste* has been illustrated with etchings and fac-similes from time to time as required. The most important article, in many respects, is an account of the late Charles Fechter's ill-advised attempt to modernize and, so to speak, romanticize "Tartuffe," much as he afterward melodramatized "Hamlet." It is not a little curious that there is no similar periodical publication in English devoted to the Shakspeare cult. —A curious work for the art-collector is 'Les Illustrations des écrits de Jérôme Savonarola, publiés en Italie au XV. et au XVI. siècle, et les paroles de Savonarola sur l'art,' by Gustave Gruyer (Paris: Firmin Didot). It is adorned with thirty-three engravings executed after the original wood-cuts.

—In the March number of the *American Art Review* Mr. W. J. Linton pays a proper tribute to his art and to his adopted country by beginning a serial 'History of Wood Engraving in America.' The first chapter is devoted to Dr. Alexander Anderson, a native of this city, born in 1775 —"the same year that Bewick (then twenty-two years of age) received the premium of the Society of Arts in London for his engraving of 'The Huntsman and Hound,' afterwards printed in an edition of Gay's 'Fables.'" Anderson's first impulse towards wood engraving was derived from seeing some of the works of this master, of whom he became a creditable disciple so far as method is concerned; for original power of design he is hardly to be reckoned an artist. He copied many of Bewick's cuts, reversing them, and was in point of industry not unlike his great exemplar. The illustrations to Mr. Linton's text are numerous and very interesting. They include a portrait of Dr. Anderson in his ninety-second year. In the forthcoming number of the *Review* Mr. F. W. Putnam will expose a palpable attempt at fraud in finding an Egyptian image in a Florida shell-mound.

—To the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* of March 18 Dr. Charles F. Folsom, Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Health, contributes a valuable article on the Freeman homicide at Pocasset, Mass., under the title, "Cases of Insanity and of Fanaticism." Freeman is the Cape Cod Adventist who actually sacrificed his little daughter in her sleep after the manner of Abraham's would-be sacrifice, and with the full assurance that the fatal blow would not be required of him: "He raised his hand to the highest, kept it up a long time to give God plenty of time, brought it down and struck the bed," and again raised it for the fatal blow. A minute sketch of his history is given, and, although Dr. Folsom mentions hereditary tendency as a very strong cause of his insanity, the physical predispositions seem to count for more, particularly a sun-stroke and an attack of diphtheria. Freeman's character was upright and respectable, and his domestic feelings strong and tender. His religious aberration dates from his hearing in the Methodist church of which he was the care-taker a sermon from the Old Testament which made him think if the book "were all true, and men lived up to it, they would soon be in the poor-house with their families." Going home in much agita-

tion, he found a copy of Mr. Murray's *Golden Rule*, containing a sermon on renunciation "by a popular preacher"—perhaps the editor himself; and then began a series of attempts to test the truth of the Bible—"to follow the letter to its logical sequence, and see whether God would support a man in it, as 'the Spirit of God leads a man in the opposite to the natural direction.'" Later he came under the influence of an Adventist revival, and took the leadership of the local body, some two dozen strong. His wife unintentionally put into his head the notion of a sacrifice like Abraham's, and did not oppose his undertaking it, feeling sure he would be stopped before it was consummated. After the first shock he comforted her with the certainty that the child's resurrection would take place in three days, and likewise persuaded his Adventist brethren and sisters. At the end of that period the three days, as in the familiar interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, became days "in the Scriptural sense," of unknown length.

—Freeman is but thirty-four years of age, his wife a few months younger. Their acts (murder excepted) and arguments can all be paralleled from the history of the Millerite excitement which culminated in 1844, two years before Freeman was born. Dr. Folsom remarks:

"So far as the other eighteen Adventists who shared the delusion of the immortality and bodily resurrection of the murdered child are concerned, little is to be said. With the exception of three, who are ill-balanced, they belong to the sensible grammar-school-taught, neat, industrious Americans of the rural districts of New England. Their delusion, in the midst of the realities of the practical life of our day, is more like the witchcraft delusion than any other which comes to my mind, and opens a field for most interesting philosophical enquiry too wide to be entered upon here."

It also reopens the discussion as to the methods of our common-school instruction; and perhaps it would be found on examination that the distinctions on which the sects of Christendom pride themselves have often no better warrant than Freeman's belief that "his incarceration is spoken of in the Bible, where it is said that God shall hold his own in his right arm," because he was shut up in Barnstable jail; "Barnstable being in Cape Cod, and the cape being sometimes called the right arm of the State."

—The recently incorporated Free Circulating Library is an enterprise which deserves to meet with complete success. It was begun in a most modest way a year ago in a little room in Thirteenth Street, with voluntary contributions of books by a number of ladies and gentlemen who wished to test the question whether there was any demand among the poorer public in New York for a library. Nobody has ever very satisfactorily explained why the largest city in the United States is destitute of a free library. Every one knows, however, that for the general public, and particularly for the poorer portions of it, access to books is almost as completely cut off in this city as it is in the Adirondacks. The Astor Library is a reference library, intended for, or, at any rate, chiefly used by, scholars. The Mercantile Society Library is not free. The Apprentices' and Young Men's Christian Association Library furnish books only to particular classes. Experience shows that to have a library in a large city generally used it must be free, and it must actually lend books. With ninety-nine people out of a hundred the difference between a library from which they can take books home and a library in which they must remain to consult books, is the difference between what they want and what they have rather an aversion for. The projectors of the Free Circulating Library determined on this account to see for themselves whether there was any demand for a library liberated from all the restrictions governing those already in existence. They very soon found that the demand outran the supply, and that the applications for books far exceeded their means of furnishing them; they therefore determined upon incorporating themselves under the State law and appealing to the public for assistance. Their plan is to increase their resources as the demand increases, and to establish distributing points wherever it may appear to be most advisable. A house has been taken at No. 36 Bond Street. We learn that during the past year the circulation was seven thousand, although the library was only open for a few hours two days in the week. It is a surprising and important fact that there was in this period a loss of only three volumes. The State law authorizes liberal municipal subscriptions to enterprises of this kind, but the managers of the Free Circulating Library have, it seems to us, done wisely in resisting the temptation to apply to the city government for aid. Politics in New York have always had a baleful influence on all charitable enterprises that have come in contact with them, and there can be little doubt in any one's mind that a public library supported by the Common Council



would speedily become a politician's football. Money would not be given without conditions, expressed or tacit, being attached to the grant, and those conditions would include patronage. To have the management of a public library fall into the hands of the hangers-on of the Common Councilmen would be a public calamity, and the managers of the new scheme show great prudence in being unwilling to risk such a danger. What is most needed now by the Free Circulating Library is money to meet the continually increasing demands upon it, and we have no doubt it will be supplied with all it needs. There are few thinking people in New York who are not aware that its condition in respect to public libraries is a scandalous reproach to its pretensions as a civilized capital. The following is a list of the trustees: Hamilton Fish, Joseph H. Choate, A. S. Hewitt, Robert Hoe, jr., Levi P. Morton, F. W. Stevens, Benjamin H. Field, Philip Schuyler, W. W. Appleton, Temple Prime, Mrs. W. C. Tuckerman, Miss A. Redmond, Mrs. E. Hobson, Mrs. J. F. Kernochan, Miss C. Emily Hyde, Mrs. W. H. Draper, Miss Catharine C. Hunt, Mrs. Angelica L. Hamilton, Mrs. d'Oremieulx, Mrs. Julia G. Blagden, and Mrs. F. C. Barlow. Mr. L. P. Morton is treasurer of the organization, and contributions may be sent to him at 25 Nassau Street. Contributions of books also will be gladly received at the rooms of the Library.

—The Bijou Opera House was opened last Wednesday evening with Gilbert and Clay's "Ages Ago." Mr. Gilbert has never done anything for the stage that was not marked by originality, and "Ages Ago" is worth seeing, if only as a dramatic oddity. The idea would never have occurred to any one but Mr. Gilbert, and no one else could have carried it out with his ingenious humor. The "legend," in which the characters of the play appear as pictures, is very pretty, and the vitalization of the portrait of *Brown*, the imaginary maternal grandfather of the possessor of the gallery, quite a stroke of genius. Here and there the dialogue seems better calculated to impart useful information as to the progress of the arts and sciences than to advance the action, but generally it is bright and amusing. Mr. Clay's music is, like all his music, good, though it is open to the criticism that it is hardly of a popular character. The two essentials for popular music are melody and strongly marked time, and one is as important as the other. Mr. Clay's songs are all marked by a very melodious quality, but that regular rhythm and beat which, for instance, characterizes all dance music, is wholly wanting. All really "catching" tunes have this, and, of course, for operettas what is most wanted is "catching" tunes. We can easily understand Mr. Clay looking down upon this requisite of light operatic music, and, indeed, we do not mean to say that his music is not a great deal better than the best music Offenbach ever wrote. So is Mendelssohn's; but the "Songs without Words" are not whistled in the streets. To combine excellence with general popularity is, in music as in other departments of human activity, a difficult task. To come as near it as Mr. Clay does in "Ages Ago" is a remarkable feat. In "Charity begins at Home," another operetta produced on the same evening, the composer, Mr. Cellier, has made a more distinct bid for popular approval. The airs are all "tuney" to the last degree, and there are a great many of them. The play itself, too, by Mr. Bolton Rowe, is much more dramatic than "Ages Ago." The characters are *Bumpus*, a beadle; *Mrs. Bumpus*, his wife; *Susan*, their daughter; *Joe*, a charity boy; and *Gorringe*, a travelling photographer. The beadle's source of maintenance is a village charity, the continuance of which is dependent on his each year making a wayfarer drink some water from the town pump, putting a vagrant in the stocks, and holding an examination of the charity scholars when the inspector comes to the village. The difficulty is that the water has such a peculiar taste that no one will drink it, that the vagrants carefully avoid the town, and that there is only one charity scholar. As the time for the annual examination comes on the beadle grows anxious, but the appearance of the photographer gives him a means of escape from his difficulties. He forces the photographer to drink some of the water and then claps him in the stocks. The photographer (who is, of course, in love with *Susan*) assumes, in revenge, the disguise of the inspector and insists on an examination. The beadle, to create a school, brings in his wife and *Susan* as scholars, and a musical examination ensues, which is very pretty. In the end the loves of the photographer and *Susan* are triumphant over every obstacle. The music is very light but very pleasing, and several of the part-songs are as good as anything of the sort we have ever heard.

—Colonel Mapleson's effort to produce what is called grand opera has not been successful. The first performance of the "Huguenots," which took place on Friday last, was far from being satisfactory. Much allowance must be made for the drawbacks incidental to such an occasion, but

the whole performance gave evidence of hasty, insufficient rehearsals. Signor Campanini, whose presence has ensured success to almost every performance in which he has taken part, suffered from hoarseness, so that even in the first act it was painfully evident that it cost him extraordinary efforts to fill the difficult and exhausting part of *Raoul*. In spite of his indisposition, however, he succeeded in interesting his audience throughout, and his acting and singing in the great duet in the third act was exceedingly effective. Mlle. Ambre is a charming actress, as she has proved in every part she has undertaken; but her voice is altogether lacking in dramatic power, and yet she is the only lady in Mr. Mapleson's company who could fill the part of *Valentine*. The same opinion which we expressed of her *Aida* applies also to her *Valentine*: she is sympathetic and thoroughly artistic, but wanting in strength and fire. Signor Galassi, as *St. Bris*, was not effective, but that was not his fault. *St. Bris* is a bass part, while Galassi is a baritone of the purest kind, and the best tones of his beautiful organ had no chance of being heard. Signor Del Puente was very good in the insignificant part of *Nevers*, and Mlle. Marimon as *Queen* acted and sang her part with perfect grace and finish. Herr Behrens is sometimes very good and sometimes very bad. Unfortunately, Friday last was one of his unsatisfactory nights, and he sang terribly out of tune the whole evening, though his acting was very spirited and effective. The chorus was not sufficiently trained, and Signor Arditì had the greatest difficulty in keeping it in order. The house was crowded to overflowing. The opera will be repeated this week, and it is to be hoped with better results than on Friday.

—The third and fourth of Mr. Joseffy's chamber-music concerts offered programmes of extraordinary interest, but their performance was far from satisfactory. Mr. Joseffy has a fault which is common to many great artists, in that they place the virtuoso above the discriminating musician. We censured the same mistake in Mr. Wilhelmj's chamber-music performances last season, and Mr. Joseffy sins in this respect even more than his distinguished brother artist. This was most evident in Schumann's beautiful pianoforte quintet, in which many passages were spoiled by Mr. Joseffy, who completely drowned the string instruments, and in other places took perfectly unwarranted liberties with the tempo. The performance of Bach's famous Triple Concerto at the third concert was still less praiseworthy. There was a want of vigorous and correct ensemble-playing, a certain nervousness in almost every artist, that spoiled the effect of the composition, and everybody was glad when the eleven performers finally met again in the concluding D minor chord. Mr. Müller gave a very satisfactory rendering of Beethoven's Sonata for violoncello and piano in A, Op. 69, and Mr. Brandt the same cold and uninteresting interpretation of the Kreutzer Sonata which we have heard before. Mr. Joseffy's solo numbers were by far the best of these performances; they were, as usual, distinguished by faultless execution, superb touch, and thoroughly poetic conception.

—The martyr of 1533, Michael Servetus, has been the object of a good deal of study recently, the result of which has been in a high degree to vindicate his memory, and seriously to damage the reputation of his persecutor, John Calvin. The principal investigator in this field is Dr. Henri Tollin, preacher in Magdeburg, who has for a number of years been engaged in this study, and has published several monographs upon it. The result of these labors is stated briefly and popularly in No. 254 of the *Deutsche Zeit- und Streitfragen*; which does not, however, profess to relate the life of Servetus, but to discuss his character and theological position. It begins with a vivid picture of the *auto da fe* of Geneva, and then passes in review the various phases of activity of Servet (this is his true name) and the charges brought against him. Servetus was not merely a theologian; he was, says Tollin (p. 7), "the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, the inventor of Comparative Geography, the editor of the best edition of Ptolemy." And as to his theology: "Whatever Servet might be engaged upon, from the time of his finding a Bible in Toulouse until his death, he was throughout one thing—a Bible student" (p. 24). A still better sketch, because more complete, is "Michel Servet," by Charles Dardier, in the *Revue Historique*, vol. x. (May-June, 1879). M. Dardier agrees fully with Dr. Tollin's judgment, although he cannot give to Servetus the credit of having discovered the greater circulation of the blood; but he did discover "the lesser circulation, the pulmonary circulation, which must easily have led to the other, and proved it in clear, exact, and decisive terms" (p. 33). He, like Dr. Tollin, refutes completely the charge of pantheism: "It would be more correct to say that he was a *pan Christian*, for Christ is, to him, immanent in the world, the soul of the world" (p. 19). M. Dardier concludes his sketch with

these words—reversing the judgment given by Pastor Henry: "A definitive judgment, from which there is no appeal, has been pronounced by historians of different Christian churches and nations, at Geneva, in Germany, England, France, Holland, and elsewhere. But the terms of the verdict are reversed: Servet is declared *not guilty*, and Calvin *guilty with extenuating circumstances*—with the exception, be it understood, of the action of the Genevese reformer in denouncing the Spanish doctor to the French inquisitors; of this guilt he cannot be acquitted—there is on this point no extenuation possible" (p. 54).

—Dr. Tollin's principal work is in examining the relation in which Servetus stood to the several Protestant reformers. About this he has published several treatises—"Michel Servet and the Wittenberg Reformers: 1. Martin Luther and Michel Servet. 2. Philip Melancthon and Michel Servet"; "Michel Servet and the Oberland Reformers: 1. Martin Butzer (*Bucer*) and Michel Servet. 2. Capito and Servet." Dr. Tollin says ("Butzer and Servet," p. 11): "The Orthodoxy of the sixteenth century held Servet's appearance for a 'sin of Canaan,' and laid upon the 'shameless' man a threefold curse. The first curse was to burn him to ashes; Michael met the fate which hundreds of thousands before him experienced. Refined by fire, he has attained a purer immortality. The second curse was the destruction of his works. By this he was for two centuries deprived of the honor of having discovered the circulation of the blood, and philologists, philosophers, geographers, physicians, theologians have been able to learn very little about him. Not till the present day has begun the more complete estimate of the Spanish writer. But the third curse is not yet healed. It is the effacement of all traces of his intercourse with his contemporaries, executed with the most painful care. To discover these traces is one of the most difficult tasks of historical investigation." Another work of Dr. Tollin is the publication of a brief treatise of Servetus, discovered by himself in Paris: "Apologetica disceptatio pro astrologia." It contains only twenty-five small pages, but is one of the grounds of Servetus's condemnation, and had been supposed to be so completely lost that Dr. Tollin could hardly believe his eyes when it was laid before him in 1858. All these works are published by H. R. Mecklenburg, in Berlin.

#### MIND IN THE LOWER ANIMALS.\*

OF books on brute psychology one may easily form a good-sized library, and few libraries devoted to a single subject would contain as much useless rubbish. But of all the books in such a library Dr. Lindsay's would henceforward have to rank as the very queerest. One hardly knows whether most to admire the immense amount of note-taking, sorting, rewriting, indexing, and consulting of Roget's "Thesaurus" for synonymous names by which to describe the same mental manifestation; or whether most to wonder at the total absence of criticism and psychology analysis which the author reveals. Indeed, if one of the lower animals had undertaken to write a book on "mind in man" he could hardly have shown a greater destitution than Dr. Lindsay presents of most of those attributes of analysis and generalization which have given to man his extraordinary eminence. The fact is that Dr. Lindsay's sympathy with the objects of his study seems to have swept everything before it except his industry. He has but a single thesis to enforce in his book, which is that the human mind excels the brute mind not in kind, but only in degree. To this end he has some chapters to show how bestial human savages may be, and other chapters to show under what an immense variety of terms, derived from the vocabulary of human operations, we may class the acts of animals wild and domestic. The chapters have such titles as "Religious Feeling," "Self-education," "Use of Instruments," "Power of Calculation," "Foster Parentage," "Commission of Error," "Crime and Criminality," "Suicide," "Deception," etc., etc. Each of these chapters is packed full of brief accounts of animal actions, with laborious enumerations of the dictionary headings under which their specifications may be classed. The name of the authority for the fact is usually given in brackets, but without reference to chapter and verse. A bibliographic index, however, of one hundred and thirty-two books (almost exclusively English, and with lacunæ at that) is appended, and a really superb index of seventy-two pages concludes the book.

The author says in the introduction that he has aimed rather at arranging and indexing material than drawing inferences. He himself considers his book to be a triumph of condensation and compression—"five or six volumes in two." From a certain point of view it would be unfair

to deny him this praise. All persons who wish for a work of reference by which to ascertain promptly whether a given human attribute is paralleled in the animal kingdom will have to keep Dr. Lindsay's volumes on their shelves. For our own part, however, we deem ten pages of good analytic work to be more valuable than ten volumes of anecdotes, however curious or marvellous. These will no more sum themselves into an understanding of the essential differences between the brute and the human mind than will the weather reports for a year sum themselves into a law of storms, unless some one deliberately "work them over." The single article by Mr. Romanes in the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1878, represents an infinitely more hopeful manner of attacking the subject than that which Dr. Lindsay has chosen.

The study of animal *propensities*, as distinguished from their modes of reasoning, does indeed have to be carried on by a collection of instances, exotic and remote, as well as familiar. And it often casts on morbid peculiarities in man a light which we are rather surprised to find Dr. Lindsay take so little account of. Consider, for example, the "feigning of death" which we find so widely spread throughout the animal kingdom, and which Dr. Lindsay describes under the head of "Deception," saying it must require "great self-command" in the animals which practise it. It is really no feigning of death at all, and requires no self-command. It is simply a paralysis from fear which has been so useful in certain creatures as to become hereditary. The beast of prey does not think the motionless bird, insect, or crustacean dead. He simply fails to notice them at all, because his senses, like ours, are much more strongly excited by a moving object than by a still one. It is the same instinct which leads a boy playing "I spy" to hold his very breath when the seeker is near, and which makes the beast of prey himself in many cases motionlessly lie in wait for his victim or silently "stalk" it, by rapid approaches alternated with periods of immobility. It is the opposite of the instinct which makes us jump up and down and move our arms when we wish to attract the notice of some one passing far away, and makes the shipwrecked sailor frantically wave a cloth upon the raft where he is floating when a distant sail appears. Now, may not the statue-like, crouching immobility of some melancholies, insane with general anxiety and fear of everything, be in some way connected with this old instinct? They can give no *raison* for their fear to move; but immobility makes them feel safer and more comfortable. Is not this the mental state of the "feigning" animal?

Consider again the strange human symptom which has been described of late years by the rather absurd name of *agoraphobia*. The patient is seized with palpitation and terror at the sight of any open place or broad street which he has to cross alone. He trembles, his knees bend, he may even faint at the idea. Where he has sufficient self-command he sometimes accomplishes the object by keeping safe under the lee of a vehicle going across, or joining himself to a knot of other people. But usually he slinks round the sides of the square, hugging the houses as closely as he can. This emotion has no utility in a civilized man, but when we notice the chronic agoraphobia of our domestic cats, and see the tenacious way in which many wild animals, especially rodents, cling to cover, and only venture on a dash across the open as a desperate measure—even then making for every stone or bunch of weeds which may give a momentary shelter—when we see this we are strongly tempted to ask whether such an odd kind of fear in us be not due to the accidental resurrection, through disease, of a sort of emotion which may in some of our ancestors have had a permanent and on the whole a useful part to play?

As another example, turn to the mania for hoarding. The "miser" has played a great part in novels, on the stage, and in works on psychology of the associationist school. He figures in the latter place as one who has transferred to the gold by which one may buy the goods of this life all the emotions of affection and delight which the enjoyment of the goods themselves would yield; and who thereafter loves the gold for its own sake, preferring the means of pleasure to the pleasure itself. There can be little doubt that much of this analysis a broader view of the facts would have dispelled. "The Miser" is an abstraction. There are all kinds of misers. The common sort, the excessively hoarding, niggardly man, simply exhibits the psychological law that the potential has often a far greater influence over our mind than the actual. A man will not marry now because to do so puts an end to his indefinite potentialities of choice of a partner. He prefers the latter. He will not use open fires or wear his good clothes, because the day may come when he will have to use the furnace or dress in a worn-out coat, "and then where will he be?" Exactly where he puts himself now by his own choice, one may reply to him. But for him better the actual evil than the

\* "Mind in the Lower Animals. By T. Lauder Lindsay, M.D." 2 vols. 8vo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.



fear of it; and so it is with the common lot of misers. Better to live poor now with the *power* of living rich than to live rich at the risk of losing the power. These men value their gold, not for its own sake, but for its powers. Demonetize it and see how quickly they will get rid of it. The associationist theory is as regards them entirely at fault.

With other misers there combines itself with this preference of the power over the act a further and far more instinctive element—namely, the simple hoarding propensity, the impulse of the collector. Every one knows how valueless intrinsically the objects collected may be—shells, postage-stamps, old pamphlets—but the collection once begun (perhaps quite fortuitously), a deathless passion seizes upon the individual to make it more complete than any one else's. Now, every one collects money, and when a man of petty ways is smitten with the collecting mania for this object he necessarily becomes a miser. Here again the associationist psychology is wholly at fault. The hoarding instinct is a blind passion which prevails widely among animals, and of which Dr. Lindsay gives us many curious examples. Characteristically enough he places them in the chapter entitled "Crime and Criminality," apparently because hoarding animals often steal from men what they hoard. Prof. Silliman has thus described one of the hoards of the California wood-rat, made in an empty stove of an unoccupied house:

"I found the outside to be composed entirely of spikes, all laid with symmetry, so as to present the points of the nails outwards. In the centre of this mass was the nest, composed of finely-divided fibres of hemp packing. Interlaced with the spikes were the following: about two dozen knives, forks, and spoons; all the butcher's knives, three in number; a large carving-knife, fork, and steel; several large plugs of tobacco, an old purse containing some silver, matches, and tobacco; nearly all the small tools from the tool-closets, with several large augers. . . . all of which must have been transported some distance, as they were originally stored in different parts of the house. . . . The outside casing of a silver watch was disposed of in one part of the pile, the glass of the same watch in another, and the works in still another."

In every lunatic asylum we find this sort of instinct developing itself in an equally absurd way. Certain patients will spend all their time picking pins from the floor and hoarding them. Others collect bits of thread, buttons, or rags, and prize them exceedingly. Now, the "miser" *par excellence* of the popular imagination and of melodrama, the monster of squalor and misanthropy, is simply one of these mentally deranged persons. His intellect may in many matters be clear, but his instincts, especially that of ownership, are insane, and their insanity has no more to do with the association of ideas than with the precession of the equinoxes. As a matter of fact his hoarding usually is directed to money; but it also includes the filthiest old clothes, old bones, scraps of paper, and almost anything beside. Lately in a Massachusetts town there died a miser of this type, who principally hoarded newspapers. These had ended by so filling all the rooms of his good-sized house from floor to ceiling that his living space was restricted to a few narrow channels managed between them. This, nevertheless, is the kind of miser the associationist psychology seems to have selected as an example of its great principle.

These few instances give us a glimpse of how fruitful the comparative method in mental science may become. It is a pity that Dr. Lindsay with his learning and his practical experience as an asylum physician should have used it so little.

#### OPPERT'S COREA.\*

THE appearance of the grave-robber in print is a unique event in literature. The author, who is described in the diplomatic correspondence of twelve years ago, from China, as "a needy Hamburg trader," "a Jewish peddler," etc., is the same whom Mr. Seward accuses of having engaged in a body-snatching voyage to Corea—"an attempt to take from their tombs the remains of one or more sovereigns of Corea, for the purpose, it would seem, of holding them to ransom." Mr. Oppert, being a North-German subject, could not be tried in the United States Consular Court at Shanghai; but Jenkins, the interpreter, an American, who accompanied Oppert and furnished the capital, was put on trial charged with making "an unlawful and scandalous expedition to Corea, and of violently attempting to land in a country with which the United States had no treaty relations." On purely technical grounds the defendant was acquitted. The author now appears in print. After giving what to

his own mind are evidently eight merely introductory chapters, he narrates his thieving expedition in the last chapter. He leaves out some details which readers of the trial at Shanghai may remember, but nevertheless, coolly and without denial, tells us that the main object of his voyage was to steal some buried relics held in great veneration by the regent of this peninsular kingdom. The ultimate purpose to be gained by possession of these relics was to extort a treaty of commerce from "the blood-thirsty tyrant," as Mr. Oppert styles the Regent, and to make commercial intercourse the *sine qua non* of the return of the stolen bones, corpses, ancestral tablets, or heir-looms. The plan was suggested to Oppert by a French Romanist priest, who had been several years in the country as missionary, who spoke Korean and knew the locality of the treasures. This was inland, about fifty miles from the sea, and the river which they must navigate had three feet of water in it only once a month, during spring-tides, for thirty hours; at other times being wholly dry. This priest figures in the trial under the pseudonym of Farout, but his real name was Féron. Mr. Oppert takes some pains to assure his readers that Féron was not a Jesuit, nor had ever belonged to that order (p. 295); but on page 299 he gives M. Féron's proposition in his own words:

"If the project I am going to lay before you [*i.e.*, to rob the grave] will at first sight appear to you strange and out of the common, remember that a great aim can never be gained by small means, and that we must look at this affair from another point of view than that which may be taken by narrow-minded people."

The italics are our own. On being assured that the "object gained" would serve as an effective means of coercing the Regent, the author chartered the steamer *China* at Shanghai, ran up the North-German flag at the fore, hired a hundred Chinese coolies, who with twenty Malays and eight Europeans comprised the force, and on April 30, 1867, left Shanghai, and steamed over to Nagasaki. There he bought several cases of muskets to arm his company, and on May 8 arrived at Prince Jerome Gulf, on the west coast of Corea. The main force embarked in boats, towed by a steam tender called the *Greta*, and moved up the river, whence disembarking, they shouldered their spades and muskets, and marched over the hills to the mausoleum. Owing to shallow water and miscalculated distances, and the fainting of one of the men, who had to be borne in a chair, they arrived at the tomb after having lost nearly ten hours. This was a dangerous loss, in view of the impending fall of the tide, which threatened to leave them high and dry in a hostile country in which the soldiery and amazed people were gathering in thousands. A fresh disappointment awaited them at the tomb, which, instead of the expected "stone-house," proved to be a burglar-proof, walled-in place, strongly protected by an earth-work all around (p. 307). Being equipped with "hardly any" implements of tomb-breaking, they "borrowed" a few in the village near by, and began the task of exhumation. After five hours' work, "instead of the expected door we found its place taken up by a huge stone block, which had been fitted into the opening" (p. 308), and which it was vainly attempted to force. A retreat was ordered, and by great good luck the party managed to get back to the steamer before the tide had utterly gone out, or the Korean soldiers could lay hands on them. It is needless to add that though Mr. Oppert during his trip held several conferences with Korean officials, and even received an autograph letter from the Regent, the gist of which was that "Corea had no need of foreign intruders," he went back to China fleecless and shorn.

Mr. Oppert has recorded his adventures and observations in a style that savors at times of Hans Breitmann, of country newspapers, and of the British slang at China ports. Many of his expressions are German patois in English words. His book, if not written twelve years ago, might well have been, for he seems utterly ignorant of events since that time. He nowhere mentions the American (perhaps we might say the Robeson) expedition of 1871, nor does he refer in any way to the treaty made by Japan in 1876. Although his unsigned preface—a curiosity of English syntax—is dated October, 1879, he does not refer in any of his chapters to the opening of the ports of Fusan and Gensan, on the east coast, to Japanese residence and commerce. His only knowledge of Chinese and Japanese references to Corea is derived from such sources as Du Halde and Siebold, and he does not seem to know of the existence of Dallet's 'Histoire de l'Église de Corée,' or of the rich stores of Japanese writings concerning Corea, or of the large and splendid maps and charts of the country issued by the Japanese War and Naval Departments. He has no knowledge whatever of the east coast. Some of his statements are not trustworthy, as that "nuptial ceremonies on the celebration of weddings are unknown"; whereas the French missionaries give elaborate accounts, as eye-witnesses, of ordinary marriage ceremonies.

\* "A Forbidden Land: Voyages to the Corea; with an account of its Geography, History, Productions, Commercial Capabilities, etc., etc. By Ernest Oppert. With two charts and twenty-one illustrations. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 8vo, pp. 351.

Mr. Oppert devotes a chapter to the language, and prints in the appendix a Korean syllabary and a voluminous vocabulary, which he ascribes to Dr. Hoffman, but which was collected by the illustrious Franz von Siebold. In his linguistic researches Mr. Oppert is at least twelve years behind the times, the labors of the French missionaries and of Mr. W. G. Aston, of Tokio, and of Bishop Ridel, who is at work in Japan on a Korean-Latin dictionary, being nowhere referred to. His statement that "the Korean language is a distinct idiom in itself, totally different from the idioms of the Chinese and Japanese," is disproved by the comparative studies of Mr. Aston, who shows that the languages of Korea and Japan are two brothers of one family. Even in the sub-title given to his book Mr. Oppert imports a Gallicism into English, and has as much grammatical right to write "the Corea" as to speak of "the England," "the Germany," etc.

Although Corea, or Chō-sen, as the natives call it, still awaits a competent chronicler, it must not be supposed that 'A Forbidden Land' has no merits. It is well bound and beautifully printed, and the illustrations are excellent. Mr. Oppert clearly establishes some facts which, to the outside world, are as yet rather shadowy. He proves that the supposed protectorate or suzerainty of China over Corea is a delusion. China has no right to meddle in the affairs of the peninsula, and she holds the same relation to Corea as to Burmah, Siam, and Cochin China. Corea is a free and independent state, and as such has entered into treaty relations with Japan. The lumbering embassies which annually set out from Seoul, the capital, to visit Peking, still keep up the farce of paying homage to the Chinese emperor, receiving the Chinese calendar as token of inferiority and loyalty; but they expect and get in return presents far more valuable than the paper and furs they give. In reality, the huge embassy is only a trading expedition, of which the Peking Government would gladly be rid. All who are interested in "the forbidden land" from a missionary point of view will be encouraged by Mr. Oppert's opinion that no country in Asia offers a more promising field for the teachers of the Protestant, as well as the Romanist, form of Christianity. His descriptions of the Korean physique, manners, customs, and religion are fresh and well worth reading, though set forth in the colloquial English of the tiffin-table. His theory of the "Caucasian" and the "Mongolian" origin of the Koreans is not fairly dealt with if dismissed with a smile, though it ought to rest upon something more than an observation of Korean infants. Mr. Oppert states that many of the children seen by him had "regular features, rosy skin, blue eyes, and auburn hair," and were so much like European children as to excite his wonder. These phenomena, however, one may see in Japan, where many a traveller has remarked the European cast of the infantile features. A thorough study of the physical traits of Japanese and Koreans, especially their affluence of beard, and their dark brown (not black) hair, as distinguished from the Chinese scantiness of beard and blackness of hair, corroborates the argument from language that the peninsulars and the islanders are of one stock. We are also inclined to accept Mr. Oppert's judgment that Corea is rich in mineral deposits, including gold, silver, and coal. Indeed, from a study of the geology of China and Japan, from the researches of Richthofen in the former country and of our American Professor Lyman in the latter, this is a natural conclusion. The agricultural as well as the other material resources of the peninsula sadly need development, and an abominably oppressive government is responsible for the present utter but unnecessary poverty of the country.

Our general impression of Mr. Oppert's book is that he has added something, but not a great deal, to our stock of knowledge of Corea as derived from Klaproth, Siebold, Hamel, Basil Hall, McLeod, Gutzlaff, Dallet, and our own diplomatic and naval reports from China.

*William Ellery Channing. A Centennial Memory.* By Charles T. Brooks. With illustrations. (Boston: Roberts Bros. 1880.)—The title of this little work suggests its slight structure. It gives a brief narrative of the leading incidents in Channing's life, and with a somewhat nearer approach to fulness essays an estimate of his character; but it signally fails to convey a distinct impression of Dr. Channing's work, that is, to show what he did—even precisely what he believed—that entitles him to posthumous fame and gratitude. This surely is a serious defect in a book designed partly for the young. Dr. Channing's relations to the anti-slavery movement are stated perhaps with candor, but without taking account of all the facts; and nothing could better reveal the want of robustness which kept Dr. Channing from hearty co-operation with the Abolitionists than the following sentence of his biographer's (p. 145):

"And what a dulness or wilfulness it implies, not to recognize the rare greatness of the man, who, with such a native craving for the calm atmosphere of meditation, deliberately at the command of conviction sacrificed his ease and comfort to the turmoil of social and political conflict—the greatness of a man who, with all his deep and long and patient thought, suffered himself to learn and to be led along, with the meekness of a little child, by Divine Providence, even though its instruments were men whose ways and manners often shocked his taste and his sense of Christian justice."

This apology for a Christian minister, who had seen slavery in his youth in Richmond, who, having preached for more than thirty years (1803-35) in one pulpit, on the publication of his first work on slavery in the latter year was disowned by his society, so little had he done to prepare them for even the moderate views he expressed, and who took this step only after the most impassioned appeals on the part of the Abolition leaders—this apology is nothing less than grotesque. Mr. Brooks is here rebutting Mrs. M. W. Chapman's depreciatory remarks on Channing in her 'Memorials' of Miss Martineau. He does not conceal, he admits the justice of the rebuke administered to Channing by his co-sectary and spiritual peer, the Rev. Samuel J. May, in 1834, a whole year before the appearance of the work just referred to, and which elicited the confession: "I have been silent too long." Mr. May reports that the Doctor's objections, "if they were as well founded as he assumed them to be, lay against what was only incidental, and not an essential part of our movement. He dwelt upon them till I became impatient." This accords with Mrs. Chapman's general statement, in a foot-note having reference to a religious topic, and so not quoted by Mr. Brooks: "He [Channing] constantly needed the admonition of the French statesman conveyed in his definition of a *bêtise*: 'C'est oublier la chose essentielle.'"

We must add that the pictorial adornments of the volume before us—portraits and views of buildings and scenes associated with its subject—give it a peculiar value.

*Memoir and Letters of Captain W. Glanville Evelyn*, of the Fourth Regiment ("King's Own"), from North America, 1774-1776. Edited and annotated by G. D. Scull. (Printed for private circulation by James Parker & Co., Oxford. 8vo, pp. 140. 1879.)—Mr. Scull is a Philadelphian and of a family long settled there and well known for its good works in times past and present; Nicholas Scull's Map of Philadelphia, prepared by him as Penn's Surveyor-General, is still of more than local value and interest. While visiting at Wotton House, Surrey, England, once the residence of John ('Sylvia') Evelyn, now the home of his kinsman, Wm. John Evelyn, Mr. Scull found some sixteen letters written by the grand-uncle of his host, a captain serving with his regiment, the Fourth Foot, or "King's Own," in the early days of the Revolutionary War, to his relatives in Ireland and Great Britain. These letters he has printed in a very attractive volume, with full annotations, and with portraits of two of the Evelyns, the writer of these letters and his father, of his correspondent and kinswoman, the Hon. Mrs. Boscawen, and of Colonel Harcourt, General Charles Lee, Lord Harecourt, and Earl Percy, all mentioned by young Evelyn in the course of his letters. It is a fact worth noting that as early as 1609 a Robert Evelyn, the great-great-grand-uncle of Captain Evelyn, came to Virginia on a voyage of adventure, and he was followed by his youngest son, Robert, who, on his return home in 1637, published a 'Description of the Province of New Albion,' which is one of the rarest of the works on the early settlements of America; and George, supposed to be an elder brother of this Robert, was, in 1637, appointed to an office of importance in the Province of Maryland.

Young Evelyn served in the English contingent during the Seven Years' War in Germany, and a letter written by him from Hanover in 1761 shows that he had learned something of war while in his teens. His first letter of the series, specially interesting on account of his share in the operations in the Province of Massachusetts, was written from Boston, July 6, 1774; he naturally accepted the description in vogue on his side, of the character and conduct of those whom he considered "a most execrable set of villains," although he had some apprehension of the result of the contest "from the unsteadiness of the English Government, the intrigues of a disaffected faction at home, and the stubbornness and perseverance of the enemies of all government here." His successive letters show his increased respect for the strength of the rebellion and his diminishing hope of an early extinction of the treason that was so rapidly spreading. His letter of April 23, 1775, gives an account of Lexington and Concord, in which he took no important share, as his brigade only went out in the evening to meet the returning column, although "for fourteen miles we were attacking fresh posts and under one incessant fire," and one of his



comrades was killed and another captured, out of a total loss of 70 killed and 150 wounded. On the 18th of October, 1776, he was wounded at the skirmish at Throgg's Neck, and died in New York on the 6th of November, nursed by his "friend," Peggie Wright, to whom he left all his little effects, with a half apology to his family for preferring her claim to theirs. His will was carefully probated by Joseph Galloway, Superintendent-General of the city of Philadelphia, on the 8th of March, 1778, for the Evelyn family, but it never reached their hands, and its existence was unknown to them until it was found in the possession of a collector in New York, who lent a copy of it to complete the story of the testator's early death. Mr. Scull has added very full notes from contemporary letters and publications, throwing light on the topics mentioned in the letters, but, after all, these owe their greatest interest to the fact that they give just the sort of ingenious description of men and events that might fairly be expected from a young officer on the British side.

*The Origin of the Homeric Poems.* A Lecture by Dr. Hermann Bonitz. Translated from the fourth German edition by Lewis R. Packard. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.)—Among American Hellenists Professor Packard has probably paid most attention to the Homeric question, which will always be a problem of deep interest to all students of literature, whether Hellenists or not; and he has published more than one paper on the subject in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, and in the recently-established *American Journal of Philology*. The mere fact, then, that Professor Packard has selected Bonitz's lecture as a familiar introduction to the subject is a new testimony on the part of an expert to the merits of a treatise which, indeed, has met with a success seldom accorded to an occasional paper. Professor Packard says in his preface: "I have been led to translate it mainly by the fact, as I suppose it to be, that there is no work in English which gives any idea of the difficulties of accepting the Homeric poems as the production of one poet, unless it be the large and expensive work of Mure, which defends the unity of authorship." He might have added that there is scarcely one so compact in any language, and the writer of this notice, who had been cut off for several years from the current of Homeric study, remembers with lively gratitude his first reading, in 1865, of this clear, succinct, and forcible presentation of the whole discussion. To be sure, certain German critics, who considered Homer their exclusive province, seemed to resent the intrusion of Professor Bonitz, whose distinction had been gained in other lines of research, upon their special domain, but all debatable subjects gain very much by the fresh vision of those whose eyes have not been wearied by gazing at minute points. At all events, there is no treatise of the same compass which presents the elements of the controversy so well as Bonitz's lecture. In this translation, which is made from the fourth German edition, the literature is brought down to a late date, and every scholar, whether acquainted with the German original or not, will be glad to have the work in its present attractive form. Professor Bonitz has been fortunate in finding so accomplished an editor and translator as Professor Packard, who has made the book still more acceptable to the general reader by condensation of the notes, an undertaking which could not have been safely entrusted to the hands of the ordinary translator.

*The Logic of the Christian Evidences.* By G. Frederick Wright. (Andover: Warren F. Draper. Pp. 320 16mo. 1880.)—It has been said that "there is no more call for discussion of the evidences of Christianity, since believers are already satisfied with the grounds of their faith and unbelievers will not give attention to anything which may be written on the subject." If this sententious statement means that the subject has no popular interest, or has ceased to have any in our day, it certainly is not true. There were few more popular writers than Bishop Butler and Archdeacon Paley, and if they are less thought of and seldom read now, except by those who are writing other books to take their place, this is because the discussion has moved on to other grounds, where the opposing parties are more evenly matched, and where less depends upon the individual prowess of redoubtable leaders. No doubt modern imitators of the old champions tilting with antiquated weapons, now against windmills and now against solid walls, are as much out of time as Don Quixote was out of the age of chivalry, and so are not much attended to; but the interest in attack and defence is none the less because both have become more scientific and strategic; and perhaps at no time has there been more critical discussion of this class of topics than just now.

What is wanted on the theistic and Christian side, and what the Rev.

Mr. Wright has endeavored to supply, is a convenient text-book or manual adapted to the thought of our own day, marking out the line of the Christian defences which his party are now holding and mean to stand by. Moreover, what is wanted, and, indeed, is necessary to secure attention, over and above ability and learning—of which our author seems to have a fair share—is candor and a disposition to rest within the lines of greatest strength; and in these respects our author appears to advantage. His book is throughout sensible and considerate, therefore inviting and with promise of usefulness. It is not often that a parish clergyman is found so well fitted as he shows himself to be—by a knowledge of what natural science is, and what its methods and rightful claims are—for dealing on the one hand with the "oppositions of science" to religion, and on the other with the objections of theologians to the tendencies or recent achievements of science. This we judge from a perusal of the first part of the volume, which discusses the principles of induction, the value and right use of scientific hypotheses, and from the pertinent illustrations drawn from physics, astronomy, geology, and natural history. The vantage ground which he thus possesses, we incidentally learn, has been gained by solid study and investigation in one field of investigation, namely, that of surface geology. A real acquaintance with any one branch of science gives the means and the right to judge scientific methods.

The second part of the book treats in general of Theism and Christianity, under the heads of personality; wisdom and benevolence of the Deity; the congruity of miracles in the Christian system; the character and power of Christianity; and the character of the evidence for theism. The third part deals with specific evidences, such as the early general reception of the New Testament, the character of the gospels, heathen and Christian testimony of the first and second centuries, the claims of Christianity by its founder, the value of the evidence in support of them as compared with that which serves in astronomy, geology, and natural history generally, and as being as satisfactory as the nature of the case will allow. The conclusion is stated in the words of an accomplished writer and scholar, that "Christianity, if not true, is the most extraordinary thing in the world—really much more extraordinary than if it is true"; that "this world of our experience is ten times more strange and puzzling than it is now if Christianity is not true."

The author is naturally thinking of "young men whose opinions have not yet become fixed, and whose minds are destined to come more and more under the subtle and powerful influence of the prevailing habits of scientific thought"; for whose sake "it is important to throw upon the foundations of our religious hope just the light which the present day affords." And it is a crowning merit of this little volume that the subject is so treated "as not to exaggerate the antagonism between modern science and Christianity." There is a copious analytical table of contents and a full index. We are not sure whether this use was specially in view, but the author has produced an acceptable elementary text-book, as well as an interesting volume for the general reader.

*Short Studies of American Authors.* By Thomas Wentworth Higginson. (Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1880.)—Mr. Higginson has secured such an established position for himself in the field of American authorship that he enters that of criticism with a more than ordinary claim upon our attention. In reading these little studies our only regret has been that they were not planned on a more extended scale. They discuss the writings of Hawthorne, Poe, Thoreau, Howells, Helen Jackson, and Henry James, jr., and are all marked by that delicate literary sense and finish of style which characterize whatever Mr. Higginson does. There is nothing in them that is very new, and here and there we feel doubtful of the soundness of the criticism, as, for instance, in the paper on Thoreau, in which he takes Lowell to task for what he says seems to him "almost wanton misrepresentation" of the Walden poet. Mr. Higginson is essentially modern in the tone of his criticism. The chief distinction and boast of the literary criticism of our day is that it is unsystematic and impressionist. It professes to have no fixed rules or canons. The critic performs his office not by comparing the subject he discusses with a standard supposed to be imposed by the laws of taste, but by "seeing the thing as it is." Of course the value of the impressionist critic's report of what he has seen will depend upon his capacity for observation, comparison, and reproduction of impressions. Mr. Higginson's capacity in these directions is not small, as witness some very delicate discrimination between the novel-writing of James and Hawthorne. He has, moreover, a singularly pure English style and a remarkable ease of expression. We cannot help fancying that he would

occasionally write with greater force if he were less impressionable and more hostile. It may be malicious to say of James: "Mr. James's cosmopolitanism is, after all, limited: to be really cosmopolitan, a man must be at home even in his own country"; but it is very clever, and much the best thing ever said in a hostile spirit about Mr. James's internationalism. Mr. Higginson would probably deny the hostility, and we only use the word in distinction from that tone of neutrality which he evidently considers most becoming the true critic.

*Insects Abroad.* A Companion Volume to *Insects at Home*. Being a Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. By the Rev. J. G. Wood. (New York: George Routledge & Sons. 1880. Illustrated. 8vo, pp. xii.-780.)—The readers to whom this book will be most unsatisfactory are those who know something of entomology and those who are most anxious to learn. It may be classed with the light literature of natural history. It was written for such as interest themselves in the habits and peculiarities of animals without making special studies, rather than for students. Persons who enjoy looking at pictures of strange creatures and reading stories about them will find it well suited to their tastes. The author has drawn much from Westwood, Wallace, Bates, and others whose names are sufficient guarantees for the accuracy of their statements. In consequence of the care with which he has selected his authorities the quotations which occupy so great a portion of the work are generally reliable. Accounts which had their origin in hearsay are cautiously given as doubtful or not proved. Illustrations of certain genera of each family of the various orders of insects are accompanied by more or less incomplete descriptions of forms and habits. Those figured were brought together from all parts of the world outside Great Britain. Some are known only to the few who have access to the collections of the British Museum. Eight or nine are brought into notice here for the first time, and it is to be regretted that these were not described more in detail. For a popular work many of the illustrations are very good; others do not bear a critical examination and will not be considered recognizable by specialists. Probably there is none more faulty than the figure named *Ascalaphus imperatrix*, in which the venation could hardly be worse, and both of the posterior wings are drawn for the same side of the body. It would be interesting to know how the author justifies himself in placing such a characteristic species of *Nemoptera* in a genus so different as *Ascalaphus*. Apparently the classification followed is that of the leading English authorities.

*The Succession to the English Crown:* A historical sketch. By Alfred Bailey, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq., Barrister-at-law, M.A., etc. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 8vo, pp. 299. 1879.)—Mr. Bailey's book is a good deal more than a historical sketch, although even as a historical sketch it is crowded with clear and interesting accounts of some of the most romantic events of English history; we need only mention the Wars of the Roses, the executions for treason in the reign of Henry VIII., the names of Lady Jane Grey, Arabella Stuart, and the Young Pretender. All these are described with as much fulness and animation as is compatible with an elaborate discussion of the law in every case. The treatise thus serves as an illustrative law-book on the succession to the English crown, probably not complete enough for the lawyer by profession, but affording to the historical student an adequate solution of many of the most difficult problems of English history. There are few historical students, we imagine, who will not find much that is entirely new to them in regard to these problems.

One of the most interesting passages is in treating of the reign of Henry VIII., especially the execution of the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Surrey. Without undertaking, like Mr. Froude, to make out Henry to have been an amiable and just monarch, our author thinks nevertheless that both these executions were justified by real perils which menaced the state, and real schemes which were conceived by these noblemen. He supports entirely Mr. Froude's view of the nervous anxiety as to the succession felt by the king as well as by the people, in view of the long civil wars of the previous century. This occasioned, on the one hand, the successive marriages and divorces of the king; on the other, the removal of all possible pretenders to the crown as soon as they manifested the smallest disposition to make their claims prominent. The Earl of Surrey, to be sure, was no claimant of the throne; his attainder, however, on the charge of aiming at the protectorate after the king's death, is related at length: "partly because all that relates to this 'young, gal-

lant Howard,' the gifted, wayward Surrey, is of interest; and partly that 'bright names will hallow' prose as well as 'song,' and, lastly, because the circumstances in which the Duke's [of Norfolk] supposed attainder was in Mary's reign declared null have an important bearing on the validity of Henry VIII.'s testamentary limitation of the crown" (p. 137). This case, occupying twelve pages, depends almost entirely upon the law of heraldry, as Surrey's overt act consisted in quartering the arms of Edward the Confessor upon his shield.

The student of Shakspeare's historical plays will be grateful for the assistance here given him in unravelling the complicated questions which beset him on every hand. An interesting point is found on page 41, where it is shown why young Richard Plantagenet was able to succeed to the title and estates of his grandfather, the Duke of York, in spite of the attainder of his father, the Earl of Cambridge. His father's sentence had been approved by Parliament "so far as his attainder would warrant it at common law only"; that is—as we understand it, for Mr. Bailey neglects to explain it fully—so far as to work forfeiture, but not corruption of blood. His father's title and estates were lost to him, but when his uncle, Edward, Duke of York (Shakspeare's *Aumerle*), died a few weeks later, the boy succeeded to the entailed dukedom. Another interesting point is raised by the succession of Henry VII., who was not a mere usurper or adventurer, but put forth a claim as legal heir, on the ground of the legitimization of the House of Beaufort (the descendants of John of Gaunt's third wife, Catharine Swinford); this has been commonly assumed to have excluded the royal dignity, but Mr. Bailey is clearly of the opinion that it did not; hence the dangerous claim of the Duke of Buckingham, a descendant of that house.

We have only spoken of points in mediæval history; the modern questions are treated with equal fulness and accuracy, but the Anglo-Saxon and Norman times are dismissed with a cursory sketch of ten pages. Surely, the claims of William the Conqueror and the controversy between Stephen and the Empress Matilda deserved more attention. There are some very useful genealogical tables; we would especially notice Table xvii., which gives the descendants of Henry VII. living at the death of Edward VI. Table xxi. we cannot understand. There is also an elaborate Table of Contents, but no Index. We will quote the passage (p. 111) which gives the author's views upon the execution of the Duke of Buckingham:

"Modern sentimentality, engendered by the security which the vigorous action of our forefathers, of the kings, lords, and commons of England has given to us their descendants, loves to indulge itself by investing every self-seeking traitor who, in Henry VIII.'s days, was ready to plunge England into civil war for his selfish aims on the crown, with the respect due to such 'traitors' as More and Fisher. I avow my own conviction that, in Henry VIII.'s reign, the doubts as to the rights of succession to the throne which had prevailed since the deposition of Richard II. had produced in the minds of almost every great peer who shared the royal blood the notion that the crown was a thing to be dashed at on any favorable occasion by any eminent member of the royal family. Such pretenders, however, reckoned without the English nation, which in Henry VIII.'s reign had no notion of permitting their splendid imperial crown to be the price of ambition, and was bent on upholding, if possible, the happy union of the houses of York and Lancaster."

*Elementary Lessons on Sound.* By Dr. W. H. Stone. (New York: Macmillan & Co. 1879.)—The author has endeavored to combine researches on the sensations of tone with the purely physical side of acoustics. The book, as the author states in his preface, contains information "intermediate between acoustics and music proper." In the main this plan has been successfully carried out. In so small a treatise it is strange that so much space has been given to large illustrations. In some cases the men who listen to vibrations are portrayed on a scale better suited for a pictorial paper than for even a popular scientific treatise. An American is naturally surprised to find the telephone dismissed with five lines, which convey only the intimation that it is an instrument for transmitting musical tones. Perhaps an American would have given too much space to very modern ideas. Edison's phonograph, the author says, "traces the impression on a sheet of tinfoil, as will be more fully described in a later chapter." This promise is not fulfilled; we have looked in vain for the later chapter. The author falls into a common error when he speaks of the microphone as an instrument for magnifying sound, and calls it essentially a relay. The microphone does not magnify sounds, but merely permits one practically to place the tympanum of the ear nearer the source of sound. The book is essentially English in the characteristic of being thorough and trustworthy in old facts and sluggish toward new developments. It is, nevertheless, a valuable treatise.



## Fine Arts.

## THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM.

SAVE the loan collection of modern paintings, most of the objects at the Metropolitan Museum of Art are familiar to New York amateurs, but they have never before been seen to any one's satisfaction, and have, of course, never been seen at all by the mass of the general public. Whatever benefit is to be obtained from an acquaintance with them the public has now, however, every opportunity to secure. The building, though only one-twelfth, we believe, of the structure designed to be hereafter completed, is amply commodious for its present contents, both permanent and lent; and its conveniences have apparently been appreciated so far by many persons who never entered the old galleries in Fourteenth Street, and to whom art itself is a novelty. At present the museum is a kind of sensation; whether, when it ceases to be this, popular interest in it will continue must depend, certainly, upon the continuous effort of the managers to make it attractive as well as instructive. Its permanent possessions, except the Avery and Di Cesnola collections, are not yet of large importance. The show of sculpture has still a hap-hazard appearance, and its prominent objects remain Mr. Story's rather commonplace conceptions, with their evident effort after repose and their obvious struggle for severity. The array of old masters is large, but much of it quite apocryphal enough to prevent it from being imposing, and altogether inferior to the Bryan collection at the Historical Society, which by the way nobody visits, though it has been virtually open to the public for years. The collection here is, nevertheless, interesting, and to students who never have been abroad should be valuable; the difference between old masters and modern being after all more in mental attitude than in technique, and a reasonably faithful copy of the Mona Lisa, for example, such as there is here, much better than nothing, and quite as instructive as the scores of contemporary works to be seen in the other rooms. The old canvases are now, moreover, enforced by several temporary accessions, and, indeed, we are not sure that, everything considered, the galleries given over to them are not a good deal more satisfactory than those at the west end of the museum, which are devoted to contemporaries. Such an impression, at all events, is deepened by a small canvas by Leonardo, of the daughter of Herodias with the head of St. John the Baptist, to instance the most noteworthy painting, perhaps, that the museum now contains. It has been long in this country, but has not hitherto, we believe, been exhibited by its owner, perhaps out of timorousness at the scepticism customarily manifested in the teeth of never so overwhelming documentary evidence. The presumption against the genuineness of so important a work, owned at such a distance from where it would naturally be most prized, is not slight, of course; but intrinsic evidence is more convincing than any other, and, so far as a painting may do so, this seems to carry its authorship on its face. It is certainly not faultless, but its shortcomings are very much those to be found in Da Vinci. In its presence, at any rate, any question of its genuineness will interest professed *virtuosi* more intimately than any one else. There are four figures, or rather four heads. Salome, the centre of the action and interest, has the face and wears the half smile which Leonardo never tired of painting, and which it sometimes seems his chief distinction to have known how to fit to the most widely-sundered moral traits. She is a very lovely object, and at the same time endued with the requisite repulsiveness; the man who extends to her the pallid head, yet dripping blood, has an expression which beside hers is intense horror. In idea, what one remarks most prominently is the subtlety with which so cruel a tragedy is elevated into dignity and beauty without losing anything of its tragic effectiveness. In its other elements it is quite as remarkable perhaps. Both in linear and color design it is extremely decorative: from a distance too great to distinguish details one is charmed by the grace of its composition, and its glow as of stained glass. These qualities more than counterbalance the precision of treatment which operates a little against its force and causes it to fall just short of largeness, it may be; in treatment, it is well enough known, Leonardo was not always what we mean by "large."

The modern paintings in the mass have at first a curious look, which one presently discovers to proceed from the novel notion, conceived in a moment of inspiration by the hanging committee and executed with intrepidity, of hanging foreign and American pictures side by side. It results from this that one's mind is a little confused, and it is difficult to tell whether the collection is upon the whole better or worse than the loan

collection at the Academy in 1876; we incline to the latter opinion. There are, however, very many admirable works, and not a few that have never been seen before outside of their owners' galleries. They are numerous enough and admirable enough to create a doubt as to whether the hanging committee is to be credited with courage or reproached with cruelty for the opportunity it has afforded every one of seeing the precise relative position much American painting at present occupies. One may visit an exhibition of exclusively American pictures, and then one exclusively foreign, and still permit his prejudices to preside in his comparative criticism without being keenly aware of it. But it is impossible not to respond to the challenge here proclaimed and reflect that, whereas the majority of the foreign pictures are by picked men, however widely different in point of merit, the home product is accepted in the mass and in virtue of its being American; and even cursory observation justifies the obvious *a priori* induction. However agreeable it may be to those who bring patriotism into the consideration of art to see one of Mr. Sartain's most solidly-painted Eastern market-scenes in juxtaposition with a pale and puerile Hamon, it cannot be disguised that this is an exception, and that such proximities as that of Mr. Nicoll and Daubigny are the rule. They afford an interesting study, nevertheless, and serve to point clearly the essential differences between works done in a society where art is old, and those of which the authors are of necessity still too much concentrated upon methods and materials to play with them in entire freedom. Mr. Eakins's "Chess-Players," for an apt example, is placed between a figure by Meissonier and one by Zamacois. All three are cabinet canvases, and are of much the same relative importance. Mr. Eakins, moreover, no more represents the average American painter than either of the others represents the average of the French school—as it is loosely enough called; on the contrary, in both original force and training he is one of the best painters that we have. His picture is infinitely more elaborate than either of the others; in almost every detail of it there is no definite fault to find; it employs almost every technical resource known to the painter in producing almost every technical excellence that a painting need possess. But compared with its neighbors it has the look, equally unmistakable and indescribable, that mental crudity always has; the figures are so real as to seem a little too much like portraits of three Philadelphia merchants; the air of distinction which comes from an artist's unconscious generalization from a painter's material the picture is quite without. One only needs to draw a legitimate conclusion from this circumstance to perceive that it is hardly art at all.

There are, however, several American paintings which no juxtaposition is likely to hurt: Mr. La Farge's "St. Paul on Mars Hill," Mr. Sargeant's "Oyster-Gatherers," and Mr. Thayer's cattle-piece, to take three very diverse examples; but these are already very well known to people who go to see pictures. Among the foreign works those of the Fontainebleau men and the Fortunists make the best showing. Diaz is particularly well, or at least abundantly, represented; the two large landscapes are too strictly after his favorite scheme to be more than ordinarily interesting, but there are a half-dozen small figure-pieces by him of which one or two are loose and slovenly in drawing, another singularly pale, and the rest conceived with the poetry and endowed with the gemlike color which characterize his better work; the most charming is that of a nude nymph surrounded with deep-green leafage, which comes near illustration of the paradox, a modern old master. There is no Millet of any importance, but the collection is fortunate in its Corots and Duprès, and there is a characteristic and russet Rousseau to balance another that is rather insignificant, and a Troyon in which the landscape plays quite as important a part as the cattle, an always grateful circumstance in Troyon's pictures. In the way of beasts, pure and simple, there is a sufficient abundance to please admirers of Rosa Bonheur, Schreyer, Sidney Cooper, and, let us add, Jacque. A Spanish interior court by Rico, who saves himself from being an echo of Fortuny by an almost feminine delicacy, is so sunny as to give one the sensation of noonday heat in midsummer. The large canvas by Alvarez is as interesting as an historic fashion-plate could be made, doubtless. Of the clever work of Villegas, and the still cleverer work of Madrazo, there are various examples; one never ceases to wonder at the ease with which the art of their school sustains their cleverness, and to ask why it is that this blinding light to the key of which every element in the picture is kept up, this infinitude of detail, this patchwork of brilliant hues, this kind of æsthetic *insouciance*, seems intellectually serious, and that something whose main characteristic, apparently, is brilliance should undeniably possess the dignity of fine art. There are wide differences between them, however, as one may note by turning from Boldini's unadulterated *chic* to "The

Sultan's Body-Guard," by Pasini, which is a grave and large work of a quiet elegance in color, and touching the imagination with singular strength, seeing that its sentiment gets no assistance from action or incident; simplicity could hardly go further, and its only elements are a troop of horsemen drawn up in line before a Byzantine façade which comprises the entire background. Of an equally large suggestiveness, though of an interest more palpable and human, is "The Brigands," by Antoine Hébert, whose dramatic intensity and contained power seem to have escaped the committee, who have skied it, possibly to make room on the line for Mr. J. G. Brown's aged fiddler; it is a great pity, both because so few of Hébert's things come to America and because it is, in a dozen ways, one of the finest pictures in the collection.

The whole of one wall is devoted to paintings by the late W. M. Hunt. They are but a small portion of the number exhibited during the winter in Boston, but they have evidently been selected with enough care to make the showing representative, if not complete. They include his latest work and his earliest in figure-painting, portraiture, and landscape, from the "Prodigal Son," which was the first-fruits, we believe, of his study with Couture, to an unfinished color sketch of one of the Albany cartoons; among them also is some of his best work, such as the portrait of "Tom in a Felt Hat," which to his admirers marks the limit that painting in America has thus far attained. It is in truth finely painted, and much that surrounds it testifies to the striking range and ability of the painter. Taken together they leave a strong and distinct impression of the mind that produced them—so definite, indeed, that one needs only to know any one well to be able to tell whether Hunt would please him beyond

measure or prove a little unsatisfying. He was a superb draughtsman, and he delighted in color, though it may be that his sense for it was more barbaric than delicate. There is something so masculine as to be almost savage in some of these things—in the "Flight of Night," for example, and in the large "Niagara." What is vaguely described as subtlety seems quite lacking in him, and it is probable that he esteemed it lightly. Technically his subtlety is marked; the variety in manner to be noticed in the different canvases is remarkable; Couture, Millet, even Diaz, is traceable in one and another of them, which are withal clearly enough Hunt. His aggressiveness was so great that experimentation in styles, so to speak, of which apparently he never tired, had less peril for him than for another. This indicates his extreme impressionability—a vital quality in an artist of course, but quite different from imaginativeness. Imaginative, certainly, we should not think of calling him. Poetry of a high order, at all events, got no foothold in his mind, and though he was thus saved from sentimentality of any kind, doubtless, it is the one thing lacking to give his work permanent charm. What we like best is his portraits of women, whose grave sweetness shows how sympathetic his temperament was. To be a genius of great virility, of quick impressionableness, and of keen sympathy, and to add to this natural equipment a thorough knowledge of the art of painting and extreme skill in the practice of it, is not, however, the same thing as to possess a creative imagination and a poetic instinct. Comparisons are misleading often as well as odious, and it is only to illustrate this point that we advise the visitor to the museum after he has studied the Hunt collection to go into the other room, and take another look at Mr. La Farge's "St. Paul."

## Democracy.

AN AMERICAN NOVEL.

16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

"Sure to be very successful; and being really an American novel, is as near as has yet been attained to the American novel for which critics have waited so long. . . . It is moral and thoughtful, and has several other qualities which are not commonly conducive to the success of a novel, but it is successful all the same. . . . [Written by] a sure and practical hand. The story deserves to be read, and is sure of being read."—N. Y. WORLD.

## Cory's Guide to Modern English History

Part I., 1815-1830. 8vo, \$2.

## Dobson's Vignettes in Rhyme.

By Austin Dobson. Square 12mo, \$2.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

## Vitalized Phosphates: A Brain and Nerve Food.

THIS DIFFERS FROM ALL OTHER TONICS BECAUSE IT IS COMPOSED OF THE VITAL OR NERVE-GIVING PRINCIPLES OF THE OX BRAIN AND WHEAT GERM.

It strengthens the digestion and restores to the brain and nerves the elements that have been carried off by disease, worry, or overwork. It revitalizes weakly children.

For sale by druggists, or by mail \$1.

F. CROSBY, 666 Sixth Avenue, New York.

## NEW HARDY PLANTS.

Japanese Maples, Rhododendrons, Hardy Azaleas, Magnolias, Roses, Purple Beeches, Choice and Rare Evergreens, in large quantities.

All kinds of Fruit and Ornamental Trees, Shrubs, and Vines.

Price-Lists free. Descriptive Catalogues, 10 cents.

PARSONS & SONS CO. (Limited),  
Kissena Nurseries. Flushing, N. Y.

## NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY FOR SOUTHAMPTON D BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company  
Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street,  
RATES OF PASSAGE TO 1  
BREMEN  
First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin  
For Freight or passage apply to  
OELRICHS & SONS, AGENTS,  
2 Bowling Green.

GOODS from LORD & TAYLOR,  
New York, may be returned  
if found unsatisfactory when ex-  
amined at home.

DAVID G. FRANCIS, 17 Astor Place, New  
York, Dealer in Valuable Second-hand Books, has always  
on Sale 25,000 volumes or more of Ancient and Modern Books in  
various departments of Literature, for Public and Private Libraries.  
PRICED and DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUES of portions of  
the Stock are issued from time to time, and will be forwarded to  
book-buyers free of postage.  
Orders for any obtainable books, American or foreign, promptly  
filled at the lowest prices.

## New English Books

At 25 cents to the Shilling,

Sent, post-paid, direct from London, on receipt of price of publica-  
tion in bankers' draft, currency, or post-office order.

The recent Custom-House and Post-Office Circulars permit all  
printed matter to be mailed to the United States with safety and  
economy, and the duty, if any, to be collected from addressees.  
Stevens's Priced List of nearly 500 English, French, and German  
Periodicals, with fuller Announcement for supplying books by mail  
or freight, is distributed gratuitously by every public library in the  
United States, by H. & L. Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York, and  
B. F. STEVENS, American Library and Literary Agent,  
4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England.

## M. THOMAS & SONS,

AUCTIONEERS,

139 and 141 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

## Administratrix's Sale.

AMERICANA PORTION

OF THE

## LIBRARY

OF THE LATE

SAMUEL R. PHILLIPS, Esq.,

Comprising nearly 4,000 Lots of

State and Local Histories, Washingtoniana,  
Lincolnia, Early Imprints of Rare  
Works, Rebellion History, Lite-  
rature, Documents, Pam-  
phlets, Manuscripts,  
Autograph Letters, Portraits, etc.

TO BE SOLD AT AUCTION,

Commencing TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1880, at 3 o'clock in the  
afternoon and 7.30 o'clock in the evening. To be continued daily,  
at the same hours, until finished.

ZOLA. NANA.

MEMOIRES DE MADAME REMUSAT.  
MEMOIRES DE PRINCE DE METTER-  
NICH.

FOR SALE BY

JOHN PENINGTON & SON,  
127 South Seventh Street, Philadelphia.

ALBERT LEVY, 4 BOND ST., New York.  
Importer of FRENCH BOOKS and PERIODICALS.  
Terms of importation to order, per franc, 30 cents.  
Free of Duty for Libraries, per franc, 20 cents.

LE LIVRE.

Subscription received to this new French Bibliographical Journal.  
Price \$11.



TV

aggr  
in t  
hem  
ava  
sing  
site  
and  
infl  
thi  
the  
thi  
ho  
Th  
an  
are  
wh  
see  
sh  
the  
jud  
be  
con

alo  
Sp  
ye  
su  
the  
ele  
for  
on  
of  
TV  
wh  
th  
sig  
th  
no  
An  
th  
con  
is  
all  
wi  
on  
th  
po  
Co  
it  
sig  
sh  
ta

ha  
O  
C  
F